OCT 10 195

Who the Author is . . .

Dwight Bradley attracted nation-wide attention recently when, he insisted through the columns of *The Christian Century* that the world was tired of the dry efforts of scholars to resurrect a purely historical Jesus. He asked, in the same provocative vein he employs here, "Who would think for a moment of trying to reconstruct an historical Faust, an historical Lear or Hamlet, or, to go back farther, an historical hero of the Homeric epic. These characters stand, not because they were historical, but because they are true to human experience. Just so will Jesus stand."

The author is one of the most successful ministers of the Congregational Church and is at present pastor of The First Congregational Church, Webster Groves (St. Louis), Mo. He has held pastorates in El Paso, Texas; Oakland, California; and Cleveland, Ohio.

THE RECOVERY OF RELIGION

THE RECOVERY OF RELIGION

BY

DWIGHT BRADLEY

MINISTER OF THE FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH
WEBSTER GROVES, MISSOURI

No longer property of the
Dayton & Montgomery Co. Public Library

LIBRARY OF
Theological Seminary

BL
48
.B68
1929

40.944

GARDEN CITY . NEW YORK

DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.

1929

COPYRIGHT, 1929
BY DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES AT
THE COUNTRY LIFE PRESS
GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

FIRST EDITION

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Critical Dilemma . . .	1
II.	The Theory of Progress . . .	16
III.	Science and the Objective World	40
IV.	Science and the Subjective World	60
V.	Religious Survivals in a Scientific Period	78
VI.	Substitutes for Religion in a Scientific Period	99
VII.	The Recovery of the Dilemma	129
VIII.	Interpretation of Objective Reality	144
IX.	Interpretation of Subjective Reality	159
X.	Reconsideration of the Theory of Progress	173
XI.	The Work of the Critical and Creative Reason	189
XII.	Worship and the Recovery of Religion	206

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OCT 10 1957
262941
Mac

THE RECOVERY OF RELIGION

CHAPTER I

THE CRITICAL DILEMMA

MAN, as he reaches toward his best, discovers himself to be living in two worlds, the objective and the subjective. Facing this situation, he finds himself upon the horns of a critical dilemma. How, he must ask himself (and forever the answer tarries), can he possibly correlate his life in the two worlds and unite his experience between them?

The objective world is that which the five senses reveal to consciousness. It is the world of taste, of touch, of smell, of sound, and of light. It is the "real world" of the so-called "practical" person. It consists of a space extending into three dimensions and running through time. It can be measured by inches or miles, by seconds or years. It is crudely divided into "matter" and "empty space." It is high, wide, and long, and lasts a certain time.

Experiments, conducted by means of instruments varying in sort, are able to refine our conception of this world of objective reality but not fundamentally to alter it. "Science" is the word com-

monly used to designate man's research and conclusions in and about the world as revealed by these instruments in connection with one or more of the senses. In the main, it is the eye and instruments devised to assist the eye, such as the microscope and telescope, that provide the material for scientific study. The ear plays a smaller part in experimental science, although it has a major part to play in giving the native consciousness its notion of objective reality. Taste, touch, and smell have only an insignificant rôle in scientific work but have done much to give the human race its idea as to the nature of the outer world.

It is an astonishing and complex array of facts that is revealed to us by our senses plus scientific instruments. We are shown a system vast in size, rich in variety of parts, and extending through enormous stretches of time; containing, on the other hand, elements of such minuteness, moving at such tremendous speeds, that the consciousness has even more difficulty in grasping the microscopic relations of the objective world than in achieving a sense of the greatness and extent of the stellar regions.

Man has always marvelled at the outer universe and, for the most part, has feared it. Even a thunderstorm, in itself a very unimportant electrical disturbance, struck terror into the hearts of

primitive men. The phenomenon of the rising and setting sun has been the inspiration of several systems of religion. The stars have been supposed to control in some mysterious fashion the personal destinies of individuals; and even to-day there are those who believe that the horoscope offers a true interpretation of events and a correct prophecy as to the future.

"Magic" is the name given to ancient practices by which men sought to control the outer world for their personal advantage. It was a sort of primitive science—an effort to discover the laws of nature and to utilize the knowledge thus gained for purposes of agriculture, stockraising, childbearing, and war; and for other important ends. Magicians were those who claimed and were acknowledged to know more than the ordinary person about the objective world and how to master it. In more recent times, science has replaced magic except among backward races and communities.

The objective world has forever confused mankind by its apparent contradictoriness; and the achievements of magic and science in tracing or seeming to trace the effects of orderly law in outer events have been of great value to the race. Yet even now, when scientific observation has done much to bring order out of apparent chaos, there

remains a certain appearance of whimsicality in the way in which the objective reality functions.

Judging the outer world from his own standpoint, man is perplexed to notice that nature seems sometimes to act with arbitrary if not idiotic cruelty. Some people live on to be eighty who merely clutter up the earth. Others, cut off in their prime, are sorely needed among men. Tornadoes drive through a city, destroying life and property. Microbes attack the organs of a genius and lay him low. Virtue is often rewarded with poverty and corruption is just as often crowned with wealth. A woman carries a baby nine months in her womb, travails in agony—and the baby lives only an hour after its birth! A doctor on the way to the hospital, where he is to perform an operation, is mangled in an accident while the patient dies because of the delay. A frightful confusion of values is seen to prevail on every hand. A little boy on the way to school is killed when struck by an automobile. Fire destroys the house of a sincere Christian while he is attending the services of his church. A singer loses her voice through a throat affection at the crest of her career. Lightning kills a farmer innocently working in his field.

No matter how great their capacity or how high their ideals, the genius and the saint will both perish as surely as will the moron and the criminal as a

result of touching an electrically charged wire. Typhoid fever will burn up the body of any man into whom the bacillus has entered—whether he be the greatest benefactor or the chief enemy of mankind. If the enemy have the greater physical resistant power he will survive the benefactor.

The so-called "laws of nature" create only anarchy in the lives of men. The objective world has no concern with the human problem. Its orderly impartiality offends against the moral and æsthetic sense of the race. Its blind justice is no justice and its apparently unswerving purpose is a stumbling block to those whose purposes for their fellow men are generous. We could not offer respect, say nothing of reverence, to any man who would treat his fellows as the outer world of nature treats mankind. We should regard as insane any human being who acted with such crazy whimsicality as that with which nature acts towards man. Rain where floods are already inundating man's fields! Drought where the land is parched and dry! Death in a family already devastated by bereavement! An undesired child in a home where there is insufficient food for those already born! From the human standpoint the objective world is utterly undependable. It makes no concessions to man's deeper desires or loftier aims.

Now the whole of man's institutional life is related intricately to the outer world. The four underlying institutions of society—home, business, state, church—are simply the outgrowth of a necessity to make human existence fit into the scheme of objective reality. The domestic establishment is concerned with the task of creating a quasi-orderly arrangement for the breeding and rearing of children. The economic system tries to develop harmony between individuals in their pursuit of physical needs and luxuries. The state seeks to set up an adjustment of relations between members of a more or less numerous community and to provide them with protection against attacks from some rival state. The church is devoted to an effort to organize the community in an outward system of belief, practice, and aspiration.

Every one of these institutional growths must use so far as possible, and obey according to necessity, the laws of objective reality. The home regulates physical sex and the reproductive instinct —but is constantly being threatened by the forces that it has undertaken to control. The economic system regulates the property instinct—but from time to time the property instinct overthrows the system. The state regulates the general life of its citizens or subjects—but subjects and citizens

frequently rise up in revolution against government. The church regulates its communicant's method of approach to the Ineffable—but constantly it is being subjected to the criticism, if not the abandonment, of those whose worship it has tried to lead. Home, economic system, state, and church exist always in a condition of unstable equilibrium, depending as they do upon outer forces for their persistence. They subsist upon a foundation of three-dimensional space, running through time. They are measured numerically and according to historical development. As a corollary of this fact they are at the mercy of those whimsical, undependable, arbitrary forces which, from the human standpoint, make up the strangely enticing, ominously forbidding world that is called nature.

Nature cares nothing for the ideals that men have connected with the home. Nature is concerned only with reproduction. Nature's children are neither legitimate nor illegitimate—they are merely children.

Nature cares nothing for man's economic ideals. Nature knows only the laws of hunger and satisfaction.

Nature cares nothing about patriotism or the ideal state. Nature knows only geography, climate, and population.

Nature cares nothing about the Kingdom of Heaven or the City of God. Nature knows only the atavistic instincts which turn men toward the Supernatural as an escape from nature.

Yet man cares terrifically for the ideals of home, property, patriotism, and religion! He loves them passionately. He is altogether willing to die for them. In the ultimate analysis he is ready to sacrifice the outward form of his institutions for the sake of their inward or subjective content. He will often break up his home rather than overlook unchastity. He will impoverish himself in the service of a conception of honesty. He will support a suicidal war in defense of national honour. He will render his mind dark and submit to a priest-ridden hierarchy out of sheer loyalty to the dream of faith that his church represents to him.

Man lives by his ideals. But nature is insolently unmindful of them. Man must express his ideals objectively. Nature grants him the privilege but coolly reserves the right to destroy, at pleasure, whatever man has built. Let man trespass upon nature's preserve at his own risk.

Regarding the situation from the strictly objective viewpoint, the outer world is neither friendly nor cruel, neither coöperative with man nor his enemy. In itself, objective reality is self-contained and conforms to an entirely reasonable course of

action. Natural law functions as natural law. When two material objects, moving at a certain speed with a certain momentum, come together (at the same time in the same place), their impact will invariably be of a certain force. The result upon the structure of the respective bodies colliding will depend invariably upon the character of their composition. If they happen to be automobiles a certain measure of destruction or displacement will occur. If in the automobiles happen to be seated certain human bodies the effect upon these bodies will vary according to definite physical laws. Objectively speaking, these facts are neither cruel nor friendly, neither evil nor good. They are facts and facts alone. They are phenomena which may be depended upon to appear under the same objective conditions in any place at any time. Science can predict them and can understand them.

Hunger, starvation, and death are facts of a physical and chemical character, as also are satiety, growth, and health. Objectively, Jesus is of no more importance than the thief crucified beside him. Crucifixion will eventually destroy the equilibrium that must be maintained in any physical organism, whether that of a saviour or of a malefactor, if it is to continue as an organism. Objectively, sexual intercourse, under conditions that

satisfy all biological requirements, will fecundate an egg within a female body, without reference to the moral, social, or æsthetic requirements of the case. Objectively,

"Imperious Cæsar, dead and turned to clay,
Might stop a hole to keep the wind away."

Objectively, nature should and must go the way of nature; and if the course of nature runs counter to that of subjective man—subjective man must suffer while objective man fulfils his natural function.

This consideration thus recalls our thought to the critical dilemma upon the horns of which man, at his best, finds himself impaled. If man were able to restrict his view to the objective, he would be able to escape the dilemma. Or if, on the other hand, he could regard himself and his world in a purely subjective way, he would free himself from his difficulty. But since he is unable for long to restrict himself to one view or the other, since he is impelled to live both in the outer and the inner world, he is in a disconcerting and deplorable plight. He is "hung up," so to speak, between two worlds, unable to extricate himself from either.

" 'O wretched man that I am,' he cries,
'Who shall be able to deliver me from the
bondage of this death?' "

Consider the beauty of man's inner world as he discovers it within himself. His home—the meeting place of pure and perfected love, where with his soul's own mate he may live securely and at rest; and wherein, with his counterpart in mutual devotion, he may watch the children of a holy passion grow into splendid life. His work—the expression of a great creative urgency, issuing in high craftsmanship; and his own work accomplished in comradely fellowship with other men and women, each contributing his own share to the common good, each receiving his own share from the common fund. His country—a great and generous republic of democratic people, led by fine men of high ideals and leading the world of humanity on toward loftier heights of coöperative aspiration. His church—the rendezvous of spiritual minds intent upon life's supreme attainment of Goodness, Beauty, Truth, and Love.

The dreams of men! The edifices of man's inward creation! The pictures of reality! The intuitions of immortality! The assurances of things hoped for! The convictions of things not seen!

"O my soul supreme!
Know'st thou the joys of pensive thought?
Joys of the free and lonesome heart, the tender, gloomy heart?

Joys of the solitary walk, the spirit bow'd yet proud, the suffering and the struggle?
The agonistic throes, the ecstasies, joys of the solemn musings day and night?
Joys of the thought of Death, the great spheres Time and Space?
Prophetic joys of better, loftier love's ideals, the divine wife, the sweet, eternal, perfect comrade?
Joys all thine own, undying one, joys worthy thee, O soul."

In these poetic lines Whitman has bodied forth the whole, profound, poignant beauty and joy of man's subjective experience. Forgetful for an hour of the outer world, he follows his soul's enchanted feet along the path of mystic certainty.

Yet only for an hour! Or, perchance, for a day! Then comes crashing through the skies of his dream the portentous doom of outward reality. He knows once more that between his inner life and his outer necessity a great conflict is raging. He is Fritz Kreisler or Ignatz Paderewski dragged by historical destiny from a life of intense devotion to the perfection of Beauty, down into the haggard awfulness of war! He is Christ coming down once more from the Mount of Transfiguration to the horrors of festering life, through the alleys of which he must walk until he reaches Golgotha.

In desperation, man has tried to tear himself

loose from the grip of one realm of reality or the other. He has tried to make himself over, so to speak, into on the one hand a completely objective being and, on the other, a completely subjective one. He has experimented with materialism and with mysticism. He has decided to give up his dreams and to become practical. He has set himself to the task of eliminating his contact with outer reality and of becoming a saint. But in either case he has achieved no real deliverance. He has only been able to cripple himself and to mutilate his intrinsic manhood. Eventually he has found himself in a coward's castle, afraid to go out beyond the inclosing moat of self-deception. This is equally true of the entirely objective and the entirely subjective man. In each case he must shut his mind against the entrance of disturbing doubt and keep himself from issuing forth into the arbitrarily excluded territory of his complete humanity. Man cannot live by bread alone—but he cannot live without bread. Man cannot live by the Word of God alone—but he cannot live without the Word of God. Man is flesh and man is spirit. The man of flesh is only part man. The man of spirit is only a segment of man. Man *must* live in two worlds. Man *must* accept and face his dilemma. At any cost, he *must* live the whole of life. He must dream his dreams and he must watch

their destruction. He must watch his dreams being destroyed and he must go on dreaming. He must live in the spirit and die on the cross. He must die on the cross and live again in the spirit. He must be both immortal and mortal, both perfect and imperfect, both unlimited and limited, both supernatural and natural, both angel and animal, both incorruptible and corruptible, both soul and flesh. He must rise above space-time and yet submit to space-time. His life must be a paradox, a contradiction, a controversy, a tragedy. He must forever ask himself: "To be or not to be?" His answer must invariably embrace both options. He must be. He must not be.

From this disturbing situation modern man has emerged by no means any farther than had those who went before. Science, instead of resolving the difficulty, has actually complicated and intensified it. Later, in a more careful survey of scientific data, we shall more readily understand why this is so. "Progress," instead of bridging the gap between the objective and subjective, has only served to mark the opposing promontories the more clearly. This we shall elucidate in the succeeding chapter.

As a matter of fact, there is no escape from the difficulty, since it lies in the very nature of human experience. So long as man is man he will

be confronted by the paradox. Should he cease to be man and become retrograde to a strictly animal status, he would undoubtedly solve the problem for himself. Or should he rise to the status of some being beyond man he would probably solve the problem. But man is man—not beast, not angel—and being man he is tortured and slain upon the cross of his dilemma.

One thing only remains to be said. Although man is man, and being man is tortured and slain upon the cross of his dilemma, this is not all. For man is man, and being man he is raised each time from the death of his cross to the life of his soul's fulfilment. By means of his dilemma man is ultimately lifted to his perfection.

That this is so, it will be the task of the following chapters to demonstrate.

CHAPTER II

THE THEORY OF PROGRESS

THE theory of progress may be stated succinctly as follows: The history of life on this planet is that of evolution from lower forms to higher. Each major change of form has marked an improvement upon previous forms. Progress is, therefore, the law of life.

The theory has much to commend it to the student and is of great value to the practical worker. If it can be substantiated an unquestionable edge will be given to the argument of the reformer, the constructive engineer, and the sanguine prophet of reassurance. Without belief in progress no reform can well be undertaken for the reason that faith in reforms depends upon the conviction that they will improve conditions among men. Without belief in progress no constructive enterprises are likely to be initiated; because their successful prosecution depends largely upon the willingness of men to labour with sacrifice to accomplish some object supposedly either to their

own ultimate advantage or to that of their children. Without belief in progress no swelling largo of optimistic prophecy can readily be composed since optimistic prophecy must needs found its prediction upon the unwavering certainty that, in the long run, man must become greater, nobler, and more intelligent.

The dogma of progress is the inspiration of what is called "modern civilization." Its acceptance marks one as an apostle of contemporary orthodoxy. Its repudiation brands one as a traitor to all that is regarded as finest and best in the life of developed mankind.

Evidences of progress are numerous and not difficult to discover. A survey of biological history reveals the fact that life has indubitably risen in the scale of complexity from the simplest of unicellular structure. The hypothesis of evolution seems to be vindicated beyond the peradventure of a doubt. Carruth's appealing lines are acknowledged to represent in poetic form the best and most acceptable conclusion to be drawn from the evidence:

"A fire-mist and a planet,
A crystal and a cell,
A jelly-fish and a saurian,
And a cave where cave-men dwell;

Then a sense of law and beauty,
And a face turned from the clod;
Some call it Evolution
But others call it God."

God or Evolution—the case seems to be won! Progress has it. From the cell to the amœba, thence to the jellyfish and the saurian, thence to the lower mammals, thence to the anthropoid ape, thence to primitive man, thence to *homo sapiens*—and at long last to Socrates and Jesus and the supermen of the future!

Restricting the scope of inquiry to the recorded history of mankind, we are compelled to admit that the appearance of progress lies open on every hand. One need only compare the situation of civilized societies in the Twentieth Century to those of the highest civilizations in past times to realize how striking and admirable has been the improvement along many lines.

Egypt represents one of the earliest historical civilizations. The relics of its ancient greatness still confront the traveller. What a display of artistic triumph and of cultural attainment one sees in the museum in Cairo! What astonishing achievements in engineering skill are celebrated in the pyramids! What tokens of pomp and dignity are found in the tombs of the kings! Egypt is amazing. Egypt kindles the imagination. And yet—the pyramids

were built by slave labour driven under the lash. Their blocks of stone were lifted by crude methods and were brought from the quarries in clumsy, man-drawn carts. The Pharaohs drove out to watch the construction in small chariots drawn by horses. They lived in palaces inferior in convenience to any modern apartment suite. Their messages were sent and delivered by couriers who ran on foot. Their knowledge of the universe was less intelligent than that of a grammar-school boy to-day. What is more, the aristocrats were cruel, warlike, and boastful. The common people lived in squalor that is indescribable. Superstition flourished. Disease was almost universal. Agriculture was carried on by means of the most primitive implements. Life, for the ordinary man, was drab, colourless, and degraded. So, at any rate, it appears to us.

Greece was a great civilization. It claimed such men as Homer, Æschylus, Euripides, Heraclitus, Phidias, Praxiteles, Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato. The museum in modern Athens, like that in Cairo, contains a thrilling representation of the glory that once was.

And yet—Hellenic civilization rested upon the backs of a large slave population. Only a nicely selected few were given an opportunity to enjoy the culture of the race. Moreover, Greece is a small country and its development was limited to

the narrow area of a few cities. Splendid as was its efflorescence, the brutal fact remains that the flower was an exotic bloom and withered quickly away. It gave, to be sure, its fragrance to all succeeding civilizations, but man cannot live upon the aroma of past cultures. In some respects the Classical tradition has acted injuriously upon the world, since it tempts men to look backward toward former glories rather than inspiring them to gaze forward to glories not yet realized. It creates the illusion of the Golden Age that has departed and blinds men to the Golden Age that has not yet come but which hard work and conscientious application can finally compass if the race will only get at it. What is more, the Classical tradition is largely a myth and proves how prone mankind is to overlook the unfavourable aspects of past times and to remember the much less common virtues of the ancients.

Rome was a great empire. But how far behind modern civilization was that of the Romans! Their roads were famous and still are being used, yet of these roads the surfaces were comparatively rough, the vehicles that passed over them were slow and uncomfortable, and their extent compared with the mileage of our modern highway systems (especially in America) was trivial. The Romans built aqueducts, but these were ridicu-

lously small and short in comparison with the gigantic conduits that convey water to a city such as Los Angeles. The Romans were good soldiers, but they fought with absurdly ineffective weapons. They had powerful navies, but a single modern destroyer, not to speak of a battle cruiser or submarine, could annihilate such squadrons as theirs in less than one hour. The Romans built the Coliseum—but every first-rate American University has a stadium almost equally impressive and commodious. The Romans developed a famous code of laws, but modern civilization has outgrown Roman law and needs to devise a better system of jurisprudence to fit the new conditions of life. What is more, the common people in Rome and throughout the empire were oppressed by poverty, ignorance, superstition, and tyranny.

The Middle Ages and Renaissance in Europe comprised a remarkable period. The Roman Catholic Church exercised sovereignty over Christendom and carried on with such pomp and circumstance as never had been known before. A splendid culture grew up and expressed itself in the Gothic architecture, in the master work of the great Florentines, in the Fifteenth Century glass, in the compositions of Handel, Bach, and Beethoven. What romance attaches to the Crusaders! What glamour to the feudal baronies! To Eng-

land came the age of Elizabeth with Shakespeare as its chief ornament. What riches were left as a deposit from those eight impressive centuries embraced in the time between 1000 and 1800 A. D.!

And yet—who would willingly return and live in those centuries? Men were ferocious, men were superstitious, men were caught in the net of a caste system no less rigid and frozen than that of India! Europe drenched itself in the blood of incessant warfare. Europe submitted itself to the dogmatic tyranny of a corrupt and callous priestcraft. Europe kept its people in darkness. Europe existed in filth and rags, save only for the swaggering aristocracy. Of invention and new ideas European authority dwelt in pallid fear. The Church instituted the Inquisition to eradicate all signs of or tendencies toward improvement in conditions or development of thought. The Protestant Reformation let loose the pent-up spirit of revolt, only to *squelch* it beneath a new orthodoxy no less superstitious and reactionary than that which it sought to destroy. Luther and Calvin managed to set up Judaism and its Sacred Scriptures in place of Catholic Christianity and its sacrosanct traditions. To be sure, Protestantism was called Christianity, but it repudiated almost every vestige of the Christian religion except that

which could be interpreted as being a sort of extension or modification of the Hebrew-Mosaic cultus.

Science, after having suffered in the person of Galileo and after a furtive beginning, finally managed to break through. And it was this breaking through of science that inaugurated the progressive or modern era in which we are now living. The scientific age has begun to set men free. Galileo, Newton, Darwin—these are the three great names to conjure with. But there are hundreds of other names equally important in the story of man's enfranchisement. Erasmus, Voltaire, Huxley—a second trinity. Then the great democrats, the men of political freedom—Rousseau, Jefferson, Bright, Mazzini, Lincoln. Then the great builders, especially the American builders—and the inventors—and the religious liberals—and the poets of progress—and the surging spirit of the common man lifting itself above all rulers and all masters until it should dominate the world!

How can one disbelieve in progress when he reads with candour the story of mankind! When he examines the plain evidence in the case! When he looks out upon the world of to-day and compares it with the world as it has been!

Here is a marvellous civilization upon the North American continent, before which all pre-

vious civilizations slink away abashed. More than one hundred million people are living here in such material prosperity as could not before have been even imagined. A material utopia! Each man and the family he represents has a reasonable expectation of the following things: An automobile; a house with furnace heat, electric light, adequate plumbing; a steady and well-paid job; a radio receiving set; a good public school for his children, skilled medical attention and care in case of need; excellent books and magazines at his disposal in a public library; rapid transportation at low cost to any point in the country; effective police protection; inexpensive entertainment according to his wish close at hand; the benefit of protection against accident or death by insurance at a low rate of payment; wholesome and hygienic foodstuffs in sanitary packages brought from every quarter of the globe; opportunity for adult education in night schools; democratic social status according to his financial means; recreational facilities at public expense; constant improvement in his economic condition according to his ability and industry.

This is a remarkable index of the development of civilization in modern times. If it is not progress, what indeed can it be?

Consider the appearance of this progress in

the works of modern man. In the skylines of New York and Chicago! In the industrial plant of Henry Ford! In the telephone and telegraph systems! In the educational facilities from kindergarten to university! In the hospitals! In the railroads and public highways! In the intricate yet almost perfectly functioning credit system! In the improvement of public health! In the great ships that cross the oceans! In the airplanes and dirigibles! In the development of radio transmission! In the broadening reach of democratic social life! In the coöperation of men in democratic political institutions! In the growth of feeling against war! In the breakdown of old superstitions! In the rise of average intelligence!

"Never were such sharp questions asked as this day,
Never was average man, his soul, more energetic, more like a god,
Lo, how he urges and urges, leaving the masses no rest!"

Progress! It is indeed the one outstanding phenomenon of the present day! To disbelieve in progress is to blind oneself to plain facts!

This having been laid down we must, however, pause. The reality of progress is established beyond doubt. And still there remains a question.

What effects may be discerned in respect to man's subjective world? Progress, as it has been outlined, is quite obviously an objective phenomenon, resulting in the improvement of man's outer world. Can a like improvement be discovered in the inward phase of man's experience? Or is progress a lopsided development?

It is not uncommon to find the critics of modern life admitting (of necessity) the fact of *outer* progress, while insisting that inwardly man has consolidated no real gains since the dawn of recorded history. Dramatically and with triumphant certainty they recall to our minds the appearance in ancient times of Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah in Israel; of Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato in Greece; of Confucius and Gautama Buddha in Asia; of Paul and Augustine, Francis of Assisi and Bernard of Clairvaux in Europe—asking us whether in modern years have come to flower any personalities greater in soul than these. Indeed, they inquire, can those majestic seers of the past be even matched by any men who have been born within the period called "modern"? With regard to Jesus of Nazareth they are still more thoroughly convinced that progress within man's subjective field has shown itself not at all. Who has ever lived so profoundly or so mightily in relation to the inner realm as Jesus?

To which assertion and to which questions one may find no argument nor any answer in rebuttal. No one in modern times, so far as the record shows, has seen more clearly nor searched more deeply into the ranges of subjective experience than these. This admission does not, however, shut the door against the further contention that subjective progress has been and is being made. Let it be remembered, to begin with, that among their contemporaries these Promethean souls were as pioneers. That they were lonely men standing upon peaks. That they had so far distanced their fellows as to be, as it were, of a race apart whose only contact with the common man was that of compassionate pity. A handful of disciples or followers sought to keep somewhat abreast of them, but in the end even these aspiring devotees found the task too much for human nature. This is in accordance with the record, especially of Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, and Jesus. The last two were actually put to death, and their teaching was intrusted to interpreters for preservation—Plato for Socrates, the gospel writers and Paul for Jesus. Out of Plato's interpretation and the work of the apostles came Platonism and Christianity, systems far less lofty in style and character than the personalities which they immortalized.

It is doubtful whether there existed one hundred

persons, at the time when any of these outstanding spiritual forerunners appeared, who could in any respect have been able to understand their real nature or the meaning of the world view which they taught. They were solitary men—isolated by their own greatness—the theme, after they passed, of legends and hero tales recounted with awed emphasis by ordinary men of the type who fear preëminent excellence while it is embodied in the flesh and who worship it as soon as its incarnation has graduated into memory.

So thoroughly, indeed, have the figures of the more ancient of these seers been enshrouded (or embellished, if one prefers) by myth, that a discriminating student must reckon always with the possibility that the very transcendence of personality recorded of them may be, at least in part, the creation of fancy and imagination. It is certainly not proven that such is not the case—and there is much evidence to justify one's skepticism as to the historical value of the bulk of the traditions dealing with Moses, Buddha, Socrates, and Jesus. The tendency to idealize runs strongly through the human spirit. Was Moses, a dimly remembered leader, made into Moses the lawgiver by later Jewish Idealists? What was the true character of Gautama? Is Socrates largely Plato? Is Jesus Christ a composite picture drawn by Paul

and the Gospel writers? There is no absolute certainty about any of these men. There is, on the other hand, ample proof that a very great deal of mythologizing went into the making of the picture of each of them.

The extent to which the major religious heroes of mankind are the creation of lofty imagination —dreams, as it were, of an Ideal never actually attained—must exert a determining influence upon our recognition or rejection of the belief in subjective progress through recorded history. If largely mythological, these Titans represent a profound yearning on the part of the race rather than a series of supreme individual achievements. Progress, thus, would be measured in relation to the extent to which man's ideals in general have come to approximate or to surpass the particular idealism of early dreamers.

Our task, in such case, must be to discover whether the yearnings of modern men mark on the whole an advance upon those of previous men. In which case one, if candid, must agree that from Moses, for example, to the present time a very decided advance has taken place.

The picture of Moses is less enticing to our highest modern idealism than is that of Jesus. Dare we then assert that the picture of Jesus as given in the Gospels is less enticing to modern man at

his most civilized level than that of any more recent character or preferably—than that of any *imaginable* modern hero?

Tradition withholds us. Our usual procedure, therefore, is that of *reinterpreting* Jesus in accordance with contemporary ideals. The widespread proliferation of Jesus' biographies illustrates this roundabout method of revision, by which men like Papini, Barton, or Ludwig state their own ideal of Perfection under the guise of a "life of Christ."

Perhaps, then, Jesus does not come up to the most far-soaring flights of contemporary imagination. He stands high—extremely high. But not at the crest, perhaps.

Let us break with tradition and enumerate qualities in the traditional Jesus which modern man has ceased to regard as those of perfected manhood. One risks the charge, nay the appearance, of being irreverent in even entering upon the threshold of such an enumeration. Yet it should be done. Nothing is to be gained by hesitation when the object of an inquiry is simply that of finding (if possible) where the truth lies.

What, then, are the qualities in the traditional Jesus which fail to attract the most civilized of modern men? What are they?

The enumeration ceases before it begins! His failure? Where can it be found?

Let one sit down before this portrait—this canvas across which the Galilean walks—and study its lines and shadings. Let one sit down before that picture without prejudice, as for the first time, and he must (if his idealism is worthy of the name) concede that man's imagination cannot proceed to farther lengths or to more Himalayan heights of character than this! Jesus embodies the dream of man's inward perfection. Beyond Jesus there has been no subjective progress.

Have we come, then, to the point of granting that, in view of Jesus' perfection, the theory of subjective progress falls to the ground?

Seen from one standpoint this must be granted. Jesus as reported in the Gospels stands as the image of absolute manhood. He defies progress.

On the other hand, if subjective progress be gauged by the measure in which humanity has been able to understand and re-create this Life in its own heart, there is much reason to believe that great progress has been realized. Mankind is more ready to-day, one must admit, to accept Jesus' standard of inward life than at any former time. More people are sincerely trying to reach the mark set by the Great Galilean than ever before. Instead of waning or remaining static, his influence grows. He looms larger than he did in any previous century. And men, spiritually, are becoming grad-

ually, painfully, haltingly, a little more like him in the succeeding generations. His poise, his gentleness, his magnanimity, his insight, his deep wisdom drawn from the mystic well of developed consciousness, are more fascinating to common men to-day than before. Jesus is still, as Mr. Wells has written, "too great for our hearts"; but our hearts, at any rate, are growing a bit greater. And in this growth we discover subjective progress.

Signs of retrogression are, of course, plentiful. But here is where lies the importance of discovering whether the great subjective heroes, in all their majesty, lived historically or represent spiritual ideals embodied in myth.

If their significance lies primarily in the fact that they lived biologically as men, the theory of progress becomes less tenable, for the reason that for many centuries no one has appeared on the planet comparable to them. If, however, they live spiritually as creations of the imagination, the theory gains in strength, because the image or dream is apparently realized more thoroughly in the aspiration of individuals to-day than previously. The average man of this century, despite his limitations, is probably more like the type portrayed in the Jesus tradition than the average man of antiquity or of the Middle Ages in Europe.

Signs of retrogression, according to the view of

those who emphasize the myth view of the subjective heroes, are less disheartening than otherwise. They mark, in this case, the failure of men objectively to express the ideal which subjectively they prize and revere. If no previous man or men ever perfectly expressed this ideal, retrogressive phases in outer practice are no proof of decadence so long as the ideal continues to haunt men's minds. They rather offer evidence of what is palpably the enormous gulf that yawns between man's inner and his outer world. Which brings us back to the consideration of the critical dilemma of man in his necessity of living in two worlds, subjective and objective.

It appears now, in view of our analysis of the theory of progress, that both in the outer and in the inner world of man's experience a progressive tendency has been and is at work. What effect, if any, has this dual progress had upon the solution of man's problem? Has progress "dehorned" the dilemma?

Instead of doing so, progress has had apparently an effect quite the contrary. The development of humanity both in objective and in subjective capacity has resulted in the more tragic impalement of its life upon the horns!

Increase in the complexity of objective civilization and the attractiveness of the outer life have

pulled man's attention more and more away from his interest in the life within his soul. On the other hand, the increase in man's subjective capacity has drawn him farther and farther from his satisfying relationship with outward affairs. The paradox has been accented, not eliminated. The two worlds grow ever more distant from each other as each becomes the more enticing. The contrast between the materialist and the mystic grows in sharpness. The difficulty of the fully-orbed man who desires to live in both realms mounts in proportion as each realm stands out with increasing fascination before his maturing vision.

Objective progress has solved no real problem for the race. Nor has subjective progress. The type of man represented by Jesus would experience more difficulty to-day in embodying his perfection than he experienced in Galilee. The kingdoms of this world are more tempting now than they were then. They offer more in the way of challenge and opportunity. Buddha would be less able to sit serenely under the sacred Bo tree to-day than he was in his ancient incarnation; the appeal of modern improvements would attract him more strongly than did the appeal of India's primitive outer life long ago. Gandhi has had to resist more alluring offers from the objective world than had

Buddha. It is more of an achievement to be a Mahatma to-day than it could ever have been before.

On the other hand, how much harder to be a creator of values in the outer world when one's inner world beckons as it must to any man sufficiently developed to be a creative personality in the modern period! How can a really civilized person be content to buy and sell commodities, to manufacture goods, to manipulate materials? How can a truly cultivated man disregard the lure of spiritual exploration and remain fastened to his daily routine of external effort?

Or how can one give himself over to spiritual exploration when the marvellous world outside calls him to its thrilling and adventurous service?

What wonder that modern civilization, despite its prowess, is breeding a race of dissatisfied and neurotic men and women!

What wonder that the inner life, despite its expansion, is suffering from cavalier neglect!

Men of the highest development are to-day yearning for God with fierce desire—yet they dare not believe in God for fear of the effect of real belief upon their faith in outward civilization. They have an intuition that Mammon might not approve!

Men of the highest development are to-day yearning for an enjoyment of the wonderful fruits of objective progress—yet they dare not yield entirely lest they lose their grip on spiritual reality.

Men are building the kingdom of earth whilst they secretly dream of the kingdom of heaven. Others are building the kingdom of heaven whilst they surreptitiously yearn for the kingdom of earth. Some lay up treasure where moth and rust consume, all the time wishing that their treasure were elsewhere. Others lay up treasure where moth and rust do not consume, bitterly wishing that they possessed more treasure in earthen vessels.

Modern men exist as if life on this earth were enough but lie awake at night worrying about the possibility of life after death. Or they talk about immortality but build their lives upon the basis of a practical skepticism. Progress, instead of simplifying experience, complicates it. Who are those whose domestic tragedies are most poignant? Not the less evolved personalities but the more cultivated. And why? Because their demands upon the outer life are increasing at the very time when their inner requirements are becoming more exacting. They desire comfort even to the point of luxury—tending toward materialistic hedon-

ism. If they followed this alone they might be satisfied. But they also desire a spiritual companionship to the point of perfection—tending toward idealistic extremism. The result? A conflict in purpose. In order to gain a point of luxury, a family must calculate shrewdly and eliminate the traits of sympathy, understanding, and unselfishness. In order to achieve spiritual perfection a family must cultivate sympathy, understanding, and unselfishness, refusing ever to calculate shrewdly or to let materialistic ambition enter their programme of mutual growth. A conflict of purpose! It ends in disillusionment and despair. The domestic structure is strained and often collapses.

Who are those whose nervous systems break down? Not the men of more obtuse sensibilities, but those of the most acute. And why? Because their energy is directed with driving power into channels of objective effort—while their inner lives complain at the neglect which they are being forced to suffer. Nervous breaking down is attributed to "overwork and worry." But work of itself never broke down any man's nervous system. Worry does this. And what causes worry? Worry is caused by the desperation of a man's soul in the hour of its famishment. Worry is a warning sent from the inner world to consciousness. Worry is a revolt of the spirit against the tyranny of the flesh. It breaks

men down if they persist in letting the flesh trample upon the spirit. Or else worry may be the revolt of the flesh against the tyranny of the spirit. It works both ways. Mysticism will bring about a nervous breakdown just as readily as materialism.

We are caught upon the horns of a dilemma!

It is not the purpose of this chapter to offer a solution (if indeed one can be found) for the problem that is intensified and made more complex by progress. Such a solution must come from a further scrutiny of the situation, objective and subjective, in which modern man finds himself.

The aim of this chapter has been to marshal the evidence which might tend to fortify or weaken a belief in progress; and to point out the fact that progress (if it can be shown to exist), instead of releasing man from his dilemma, fastens him but the more securely upon its horns.

The theory of progress seems to be not only tenable but most reasonable. Both in the outer and in the inner world of human experience growth toward improvement is shown to be the tendency. Modern man stands at the crest of progress thus far made, and he looks into the future with the expectation of further development as time flows on. But modern man is not relieved by progress of his ancient difficulty. He still must live in two

worlds—each of them becoming more enticing and appealing year by year.

We shall now turn to science and discover, if we can, whether scientific experiment and the conclusions drawn from research can be of any assistance to man in his plight.

CHAPTER III

SCIENCE AND THE OBJECTIVE WORLD

It is our task now to trace the effect of science upon the position of man in respect to his dilemma. The question is, What solution, if any, has science to suggest?

We shall first inquire of science as to its interpretation of outside or natural events and phenomena.

As was stated in the first chapter, science is the modern counterpart of ancient magic. The magician was what might be called a pioneer of science. His affair was the study of outward occurrences and the interpretation of them for the advantage of the tribe or clan. Such also is the affair of the scientist. Both are concerned with objective phenomena, with the laws (if they exist) that govern cause and effect, and with the utilization of those laws for the good of man. There were research magicians and practical magicians. The practical magicians applied the conclusions of research magicians to ordinary life.

An illustration of the likeness between the magician and the scientist may be found in comparing the technique of the two with regard to a specific situation.

Among the earlier Hebrews there was handed down the tradition that a certain chest or receptacle, called the Ark of the Covenant, possessed supernatural powers. Those who touched it, unless ceremonially prepared for the contact, were stricken dead. Its possession by an army at war insured victory. Its loss meant certain defeat. So important did this Ark become in the belief of the Israelites that the central shrine of their religion was at one time found at the spot of its location.

On one occasion the Philistines captured the Ark and set it up in the temple of their god, Dagon. Whereupon, not only did the image of Dagon fall down and shatter into pieces, but a serious epidemic of "tumours" broke out among the people. At this the magic-men (or the then contemporary scientists) declared that the plague was due to the presence of the Ark. The only thing to do, therefore, was to send the malevolent receptacle back home; which was forthwith done. Moreover, the magicians ordered that a few golden images representing the sores which appeared on the bodies of those stricken, as well as a few golden

effigies of mice, or rats, should be sent along with the Ark.

We find in this episode an interesting example of the scientific method as it was anciently applied to the study of a phenomenon. An epidemic of disease sweeps the community. It must have a cause. The image of Dagon falls over. That, also, must have a cause. The Hebrew Ark stood beside the idol—the Hebrew Ark is taboo—probably therefore, the Ark caused Dagon to fall over. This is point one. If the Ark is taboo, perhaps it is also responsible for the epidemic. Here is a working hypothesis. On the other hand, an older theory connects such a plague with the presence of rats in unusual numbers. One may choose according to disposition which theory to accept. Meanwhile, in order to be upon the safer side, it is good judgment to return the Ark to the Hebrews and with it to send a few images of sores and rats as a preventive of further spread of the contagion.

Is not this the orthodox scientific procedure? Science, to be sure, would eliminate the Ark as a contributing cause of either the destruction of Dagon or the appearance of the plague. Science, perhaps, would attribute the falling of the idol to coincidence and the plague's appearance to the rodents. Science might even call the disease by the name "bubonic plague," and would certainly apply

itself to the extermination of the rats. But in general technique Philistine magic and modern science are thoroughly at one.

We have entered with some detail into the above illustration to show how closely akin are the methods of modern science to those of primitive magic. Both assume that events are governed by certain laws which follow the order of cause and effect in practically automatic sequence. Both seek to discover what are the laws governing events and what the sequential effects are likely to be. Both apply their theories to the conduct of individual and social life.

The advance, therefore, of science over magic is only relative. As we shall argue more fully in an ensuing chapter, science is a refinement of the reason in its relationship to the study and manipulation of objective phenomena. Its novelty consists merely in the astonishing acceleration of this refinement during the last three hundred, and especially during the last fifty years.

Religion and magic among primitive peoples have always been at loggerheads until such times as magic has gained the upper hand over religion. When magic has achieved this conquest religion has become the pale and dreamy mistress of its more vigorous antagonist. For magic, dealing as it does with the world of sense impression (the

natural world), has more inherent robustness than religion, which functions in the less obviously real subjective field. Magic studies nature. Religion finds God. Magic, overcoming religion, reduces the subjective experience of man to a secondary position. In other words, it produces a cultus in which God functions as the agent of man's desire and can be controlled by man through the use of proper approaches—sacrifice, perhaps, or incantations or what not. Religion comes to be regarded as the means to an end—the end being, crassly, the manipulation of nature. Whereas religion, in its own right, must be an end in itself—the end being man's inward approach to the Ineffable.

This antithesis between religion and magic cannot be too strongly emphasized. For throughout history the two have been at grips with one another. In Israel the struggle raged between the priests, who represented formal magic, and the prophets, who represented intuitive religion.

In the earlier Christian Church the issue lay once more between the priests of so-called "religion" and such men as St. Francis, Anselm, and Bernard of Clairvaux. In orthodox Protestantism the battle was fought by the mystics and the poets such as Boehme and Blake (many of whom separated from the Church), and the ecclesiasts to whom religion was a quasi-ethical system coupled

with a proper belief in certain historical events and in the literal inspiration by God of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. In the contemporary period the greater conflict has been complicated by the contest between magic and modern science (a contest often miscalled the "warfare between religion and science," which it certainly is not), and has been thus temporarily forgotten. The conflict is, however, real; and its opposing forces are those of science on the one hand and poetic mysticism on the other. Science must of necessity conquer magic; but whether it will ultimately conquer religion, as magic has so consistently done, remains to be seen.

That science now dominates the field of objective experience must be plain to all candid observers. The entire world of outward phenomena is organized, with amazing ability, by the scientific mind.

Without developing an exhaustive treatise upon the explicit results of modern research into every phase of objectivity, we may paint for ourselves an impressionistic picture of its achievements.

The ranges of the stellar universe have been explored by the telescope, and the discoveries thus made are embodied in a system of knowledge called astronomy. Coördinate with astronomy has arisen a body of information as to the chemical composition and physical properties of planets,

suns, and stars, many of which lie at almost inconceivable distances from the earth. The speed at which light moves *in vacuo* is established at approximately 186,000 miles per second. This constant speed having been proved to be absolute, in the space-time universe, the velocity of all other bodies in our universe is relative to that of light; wherefore the speed of the universe (that is, the time dimension of the world) is gauged in accordance with the speed of light.

The laws of Newton, founded upon the theory that space is of infinite extent and that time is infinite also, have been revised to fit the demands of more recent discoveries, particularly that the absolute speed of light is finite (186,000 miles per second) and that space is curved around upon itself.

The explorations of scientists into the ultimate nature of space, matter, and energy represent what are among the most thrilling of all human adventures. The tales told by these explorers sound to our ears as unlikely and impossible as did the report of Marco Polo to the Venetians. They describe to us a universe more fantastic to "common sense" than the fairylands of Grimm or the world of the Arabian Nights.

Yet they can prove their assertions with plain, sober, mathematically accurate statistics. They

come to us, so to speak, with an album of photographs and tell us that these can be verified by any other adventurous persons who may be willing to train themselves and go with them upon a trip to those regions

"Where kings of thought play chess with stars,
Upon their boards of blue."

The appearance of such phenomena as that of an electrical discharge in a thunderstorm is accounted for in the most elementary way. A boy of ten can understand it. But the more subtle manifestations of electric energy are explained also—as indeed is the very nature of electricity itself.

The layman is baffled and abashed before the involved description of the most commonplace experiences. A star is shining in a clear sky, which is a simple enough matter. But—why does it shine? And why is its radiance tinged with red? And how far away is it? And why is it there? And how do you know that all this is so? Science can tell us how!

Even to look up at the crowded heavens to-day is to invite oneself into a maddening confusion of thought! Space—who said that it is curved? Light years—who measured them? Speed of light—how can anyone time a ray of light? Light is a material substance—who found that out? Elec-

trons and protons—how can the scientists locate such small things? One three-trillionth of an inch in diameter? It passes comprehension!

To which science answers, "I shall be happy to explain it all to you if you will sit down with me and let me teach you."

And science answers also in another way, buttressing faith by its works. Now come forward the inventors and engineers with unbelievable new wonders. The telescope is old—wireless is growing old—the radio has become a household necessity. But fresh marvels are offered us in proof of science's continuing devotion. Will we be pleased to send our photographs by wire? Would we care to hear the movie actors speak their lines? Perhaps we should prefer to cross the ocean by air?

As a matter of fact, so indebted are we all to science that, like a man whose obligations exceed his assets by so much as to render the very idea of payment ridiculous, we merely take what is offered and forget to be grateful. The gifts of science are the equipment of our daily existence. Our environment is planned in the research laboratories and created in the factories. We live, move, and have our being in a world of scientific production.

Our houses would be mere shells—nay, would scarcely get built—without science. Scientific con-

262941

struction erects them and scientific planning arranges and equips them. Experts in heating tell us what we need for warmth, experts in lighting explain the psychological value of proper illumination; experts in sanitation show us how to be hygienic; experts in efficiency install the right sort of cooking apparatus and the best type of refrigerating mechanism. After that we feed ourselves under the auspices of scientific dietitians who warn us lest we omit celery from the turkey dinner or orange juice from the breakfast menu.

By science we arise in the early morning to rhythmic orders over the radio. By science we start our automobiles. By science we drive to our various places of occupation. By science we remain at home, washing the family linen or submitting the floors to a process of vacuum cleaning. By science we order the groceries. By science we receive our foodstuffs from afar. By science we pass the day and survive the night. By science we turn the darkness into radiance and steal the resources of a universe for a whim.

Science has become man's friend and counsellor and guide.

Our place as men within the scheme of things is located for us by science. Through painstaking study the biologist extracts the truth about our ancestry and determines our standing among the

various sports and vagaries of evolution. He connects us by cords of biochemical affinity with every species, extant or disappeared, that has fulfilled its history on the planet. Within our bodies he finds the evidence to prove that once we lived in the sea, and that we later ambled on all fours, and subsequently learned to walk upright and use our hands.

Of the scientist it may well be said, paraphrasing a Psalm, "He knoweth our down-sittings and our uprisings." In the person of the psychologist, "He knoweth our thoughts afar off."

Nothing is hidden from the scientist nor is there any nook or cranny where he fears to explore. Gently yet firmly he insists upon being admitted behind doors long closed against the curious. Not content with his triumphs amid the throngs of space nor with his achievements among the microcosms of matter, he essays to enter the fields of history, ethics, and economics.

Scientific history has revealed many hitherto glossed-over or unnoted facts about past civilizations and eras. Many an idol has been shown to have feet of clay by modern historians of the scientific school. And many sacrosanct figures have lost their glamour beneath his analytic treatment. Through the study of the various sacred scriptures, and especially those of the Hebrew-Christian

cultus, scientific method has served to reduce revelation to folklore and myth. The Hebrews are shown to have been what they literally were—an unnumerous aggregation of Semites whose pride was entirely out of proportion to their real merit. From the text criticism and historical criticism of the Bible has been derived a fair estimate of the contribution of this race to general civilization; a very remarkable contribution, indeed, but one by no means so unique as that with which pious tradition has credited it.

Scientific analysis of the New Testament has succeeded in breaking down the fabric of an entire system of religion, leaving in tattered shreds a faith once woven of enduring material. Theologically bankrupt, Christianity persists by force only of inertia. Its dogmas, founded upon a supposedly divine revelation, are not able to maintain themselves without their original substructure. Christianity, therefore, as a system of belief, is tottering, for the reason that historical analysis, presented in a scientific spirit, has disproven the assumption upon which it rested. It is only by resort to sentiment, or to an ethical overemphasis, or to allegorical interpretation (a feeble and unsatisfactory resort!) that the protagonists of Christianity can postpone its eventual disappearance. As an objective phenomenon the Chris-

tian system has passed its perihelion and will follow its predecessors back into oblivion. For this, science is responsible!

Jesus Christ, on the other hand, as a sublime Ideal, is brought to the forefront of modern thought by the very power which has compassed the destruction of the system built up about his name. Disassociated from Christianity as a cult (or Church) he becomes the embodiment of a beautiful Dream in which all mankind may share. Science has rescued Christ from Christianity and has restored him to the soul of man. But, as we shall point out later, science has accomplished this unwittingly. For with the soul of man science has and can have no traffic. Science halts where man's soul begins.

The boon conferred by science in this realm is simply that of having wrought the discomfiture of magic (or pre-science). When the ecclesiastical magicians of Christendom finally dominated the mystical poets of the Christ-way (Paul, John, Chrysostom, for example) they established a sovereignty which was to endure—with periods of decline, but always strong enough to come back—until the scientific age. At last this rule is over and this tyranny dethroned. But, in parenthesis, let us here warn science lest in its turn it set up a new

tyranny no less irksome than the old! For science, not content with having conquered magic, is to-day threatening to extirpate religion as well!

Passing from historical criticism, we find that science has entered into the fields of ethics and economics with a temerity unknown in any previous time.

Having inherited a fixed code of personal and public morals from our forefathers—they in turn having received their code from the mingled strains of folk practice antecedent to their own—our race had grown into the habit of accepting its inheritance as a legacy not to be disturbed. (This has, of course, been equally true of all civilizations or cultures.)

Science, however, has disturbed our legacy! It has come to cast doubt upon the sacrosanctity of every custom, every rule, by which our life has been governed. Whatever persists, when science has done its work, does so simply because its persistence is justified by scientific tests.

The basis of any civilization is its domestic structure called by our tradition "the home." Christian civilization was founded upon what might be termed the practice of *conventional* monogamy. That is, while monogamous mating was held to be the ideal, its rigorous standard was

modified by a willingness to overlook sexual lapses in men before marriage; or, once marriage was entered upon, to forgive (albeit with reproof) the occasional vagaries of males in relation to what were called "fallen women" or prostitutes. Prior to the scientific period, prostitution was a recognized institution, with certain sections of the community set apart for the habitat of women who were engaged in the "profession."

Women, on the other hand, received no such liberties in sexual life as did men. "Chastity," defined as the absolute fulfilment of monogamous conditions, was enforced among women by public opinion as well as by the ordinances of the Church and the statutes of civil law. A girl must come to marriage an untouched virgin—and within marriage must observe an unimpeachable loyalty to her mate. Physically she belonged to her husband and her body was at his disposal. Thus was created an "unwritten law" which led, in practice, to the so-called "double standard of morality." Thus, also, grew up the habit of dividing women into two classes—the "good" women and the "bad." Let a woman but step aside, even once, either before or after marriage, from the path marked so plainly for the feet of virtue, and she lost her standing as a "good" woman. She could never hope to come back!

If, among the aristocrats, this rule was honoured often in the breach, its authority was never openly questioned. Christian civilization depended for very existence upon its tacit acceptance by every member of society.

The entrance of science into the study of sex morality, however, has considerably altered the situation. Monogamy as an ideal is certainly not less highly regarded than before; but the manner in which monogamous mating is encouraged is greatly changed. In the first place, monogamy as a *conventional* practice is discounted. As a *form* of social behaviour it has been found strikingly inadequate. Its value lies in the psychological area of life. When, therefore, it is merely a conventional relationship, emotionally unsatisfactory and destructive of legitimate individual aspirations, science concludes that its function is not being fulfilled. Monogamy, to a scientific mind, does not exist as a means to an end that individuals become acquainted with suffering; but rather, that individuals may gain in constructive ability. Divorce, where science has achieved influence, becomes more frequent; for the reason that, scientifically judged, it is better for a man and a woman to sever their relationship (better for them, better for their children, better for society) than to

maintain it upon terms of hatred, jealousy, and despair.

What is more, science looks with more lenience upon all lapses from the strict ideal—in women as well as men. Science seeks to understand the physico-psychic causes of marital maladjustment and suggests remedies that will (if possible) *remove* the causes, instead of ignoring the cause and tinkering with the effect.

Without proceeding to a further detailed analysis of the scientific approach to this problem, we may sum up the matter by remarking that, in the long run, science promises to do more to effectuate an honest and healthful monogamy than Christian magic or civil statutes have been able to do. Science eliminates the sharp differentiation between "good" and "bad" women. Science is abolishing the professional prostitute—or is, at least, leading a tendency in that direction. Science removes the "double standard" and places men and women on an equal footing. Science substitutes analysis for condemnation, therapeutic treatment for punishment. Science seeks to apply the laws of social relativity to the encouragement of an idealistic Dream!

This, of course, indicates the weakness of science as well as its strength. Danger lies in the fact that social relativity so easily comes to dis-

place the idealistic Dream. But of this we shall speak at more length in the ensuing chapter.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Hoover's recent and now famous definition of Prohibition may be accepted as the perfectly scientific description of all social, economic, and political relationships. He called Prohibition "a great social and economic experiment, nobly conceived and far-reaching in purpose." Seen in the large, this is exactly what the scientific mind must conclude all of man's civilized institutional practices to be—great social and economic (and political) experiments, nobly conceived and far-reaching in purpose.

Regarded thus, institutional life is tentative, relative, experimental. No institution is sacred in itself, nor can any institutional form justify its persistence after its value (as an experiment) has been found to be departed. And what, scientifically, constitutes a "value"? Simply the force that is exerted in the direction of man's developing and improving life. And what is development and improvement? To science, development and improvement are phenomena associated with the acceleration of man's objective progress!

Once more, then, we return to our dilemma. Shall science, in the objective field, serve to deliver humanity from its difficulty? As the result of scientific advance, will man be able to bridge the gap

between the outer and the inner world? Palpably not! For science is the servant of outer progress; and as we have seen, outer progress only aggravates the difficulty.

Science has routed magic. This is the great and outstanding fact. The outer world is more nearly man's slave to-day than ever before. No rites, no incantations, no sacrifices, no importunate prayers, no rubbing of Aladdin's lamp, could possibly have brought to pass the amazing displacements of natural law that scientific research and its practical application have accomplished. Yet—science proves all things in the outer world to be relative. Nothing is final and there is no Absolute. Perfection lies beyond the range of scientific scrutiny and its attainment passes scientific invention. While inwardly man is content with nothing less than Perfection, spiritually he demands the Absolute.

The only way, therefore, in which science can save man from his dilemma is to prove to him that his inner life is unreal. Should science once be able to prove this and reduce the subjective world to nothingness, then indeed would mankind be free and his future, as an improving and progressing mechanism, would be assured—*relatively!* That is, it would be assured in relation to space and time, *but only so!*

Let us turn our attention, then, to the warfare between science and religion—which, in other words, is the age-long struggle of man's soul for survival against the overwhelming pressure of the objectively and outwardly Real!

CHAPTER IV

SCIENCE AND THE SUBJECTIVE WORLD

If, in its approach to the objective world, science has been able to achieve results that surpass in fabulousness the miracles reported from all past time, the victory has been won at the expense of magic, or (what is the same) the prescientific view of nature.

But magic and science together are at one in their hostility to religion. Science, as an extension or an evolution of magic, seeks to carry on the ancient feud. It picks up the torch thrown down by its fallen predecessor. It proceeds to the attack upon man's subjective world in order that it may destroy his faith in it.

This must be so in the very constitution of things. Just as, indeed, it must be so that religion, representing man's subjective experience, will overthrow the objective world if it can.

The two realms are antipathetic. They stand one over against the other. Their existence disrupts man's peace and their rivalry causes man's struggle.

If, once and for all, it could be proven to mankind that either one or the other of the realms were unreal, no longer would the human race be impaled upon the horns of its dilemma!

Mysticism sets about to show that the objective world is unreal; to demonstrate that man need not give the slightest concern to it. Let him but deny its existence and set himself to a focussed concentration upon inner facts—and lo! the illusion of time and space will vanish. Material substance will thin out to a shadowy vapour. The evils of physical life will eliminate themselves. No pain, no trouble, no wrongdoing, not even death will remain. Imperfection will become perfection. Evil will be overcome by good. Death will be swallowed up by Life. The world will be lost in eternity. Man will be free of his bonds and the soul of man will enter into its paradise.

So say the mystics. And they speak the truth. If man should or could wipe out all consciousness of the outer world, he would indeed win a great freedom!

He would, however, cease to be man! He would not be even superman! His very nature, so altered, would prove him to be a different creature—disembodied, discarnate, the denizen of a world no longer subject to the laws that establish and govern space-time.

Religion, left to itself and unopposed, would employ its best endeavour to create such an extramundane being. But religion does not enjoy the privilege of going without opposition. Religion must meet science upon the battle ground of experience; and in their meetings science (as magic before science) claims the advantage.

Science claims the advantage for the reason that objective reality is more obviously apparent to man's consciousness than subjective reality. The outer world is more plain to man, more definitely marked, than the inner world. It is easier for him to realize his body than to recognize his soul.

On the other hand, man cannot easily forget his soul. He is haunted always, even in his most objective moods, by the memories of a spiritual homeland. He cannot cease from his dream.

No such expression of man's yearning for his spirit's kingdom has ever been given as that found in the One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Hebrew Psalm:

"By the rivers of Babylon,
There we sat down, yea, we wept,
When we remembered Zion.
Upon the willows in the midst thereof
We hanged our harps.
For they that led us captive required of us songs,

And they that wasted us required of us mirth,
saying,
Sing us one of the songs of Zion.
How shall we sing Jehovah's song
In a foreign land?
If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,
Let my right hand forget her cunning.
Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,
If I remember not;
If I prefer not Jerusalem
Above my chief joy."

Herein is heard the cry of man's soul as it languishes in the captivity of the objective world. To religion, the outer world is Babylon—and in Babylon the lovers of Zion cannot sing their songs!

In spite of certain well-meant efforts in our day to arrange an armistice between religion and science, such an arrangement cannot be other than unsatisfactory except, perhaps, to the shallow and sentimental. Science has conquered magic (sometimes miscalled religion) and now, strong by virtue of its conquest, turns its attention to the ancient foe of all objective experience. Christian Science and other quasi-mystical, pseudo-scientific cults seek to introduce a new element into the struggle and thus to end it: but while they achieve certain practical results they cannot hope to resolve the difficulty. Their appeal, as will be shown in a following chapter, is only to those who are so weary with the

strife and so fearful of losing their grip upon both worlds that they flock to the standard of anyone who promises them a way out. Christian Science, for example, offers its adherents complete inward perfection as well as great outward well-being. So also do New Thought and other like movements. Deny matter, abandon "mortal error," they say, and we will provide you with spiritual powers that will bring you not only your soul's satisfaction but also everything that you may desire of worldly goods—money, health, popularity, success! The product of such teaching is a type of person whose religion is materialistic and whose materialism religious. He gets around the old difficulty by turning Mammon into God and by making God in turn the servant of Mammon. The outer world is denied in theory but cultivated in practice, while the inner world is cultivated in theory and denied in practice. The horns of the dilemma are thus upholstered with neat cushions and it is only after long wear that the upholstery begins to flatten down and let the horns thrust through! But of this, more later.

Science, when honest with itself, can have no direct intercourse with religion. Scientific men, to be sure, may be very religious; but they are religious as *men,* not as scientists. They cannot carry the technique of religion into research without

jeopardizing their scientific method; neither dare they intrude their scientific method upon the privacy of religion without disturbing their spiritual periods. If this statement appears to be too drastic, let us examine it more carefully.

Suppose, for example, that an astronomer is gazing through his instrument upon a planet which moves at a great distance from the earth. As a scientist he is gathering data which must be accurately noted and which, later, he must correlate with previously known and proven facts. It is imperative that he maintain an attitude of thoroughgoing skepticism with respect to any possible phenomena that may be revealed to his gaze and measured by his instrument. Moreover, his conclusions must be explicit, mathematically exact and demonstrable to any other person who may at some future time seek to verify them.

Now suppose, further, that this astronomer be also a man of profoundly spiritual nature whose experience in the subjective realm has been rich and plentiful. And suppose that, enthused by the majesty and wonder of the heavenly bodies, he permit himself to be led on to mystical speculation as to the relationship of God to all those far-flung bodies in stellar space. And suppose, finally, that he incorporate with his mathematical observations

a series of rhapsodic ejaculations about "the wonderful works of God in creation."

There is only one answer. By permitting his subjective experience to run over into objective research he has distorted both his spiritual and his objective vision. He cannot by mere astronomical experiment find any trace of God—his idea of God having been derived from his inner world view. He has simply projected a discovery made in one realm over into another realm—which is very bad science indeed. On the other hand, he has mixed up his approach to subjective reality with a technique adapted only to the scrutiny of outward reality—which is very bad religion indeed. As a scientist he becomes either a theologian or a speculative philosopher, which is tantamount to becoming no longer a scientist. As a mystic he becomes a quasi-scientist, tending to rely increasingly upon outward phenomena to prove the existence of a reality which can be proven to exist by the soul's deep brooding and in no other way at all.

If, now, this astronomer should confine his scientific judgments to the objective realm, and keep his religious impressions within the range of subjective experience, he would possess both his science and his religion in pure and unadulterated form. He would be a trustworthy astronomer and an authentic mystic. He would recognize the differ-

ence between the two worlds in which he lives and works; knowing that as a scientist his knowledge must always be relative, and that as a mystic his knowledge must, by the same token, always be absolute. He would face his situation as a human being and accept the dilemma as given. Then, regarding his two worlds as separate and distinct—one the perfect world of inner illumination and the other an imperfect world of outward sense—he would make up his mind to live in both worlds as a man and meet the issue with courage and a high heart.

It happens that Sir Isaac Newton at some points failed to keep in mind this necessary distinction; and at those points his status as a scientist dwindles considerably in height. He was wont, occasionally, to express his views on theological and metaphysical questions, deriving his opinions from the accepted doctrines of his time. In every case Newton's speculations about the metaphysical realm were weak and futile, and carry no weight either with contemporary scientists or with the mystically minded. He was a religious man and should have kept religion where it belonged—quite apart from his studies in the physical constitution of the objective world!

Certain distinguished scientists of our own day have fallen into the same error. Scientifically these

men occupy the most distinguished rank. Spiritually they are undoubtedly men of profound and rare insight. But it is no stricture upon them in their dual capacity—men of science and men of soul—to remark that scientifically they gain nowise in prestige and that spiritually they render no real service in attempting to rehabilitate religion in scientific terms. Men will be religious because they seek the kingdom of heaven within their souls and for that reason only. Men will be scientific as they consult and analyze phenomena in the outward world and in no other way. No man's religion was ever fortified by an appeal to science and no man's science was ever buttressed by an appeal to religion. The two must stand, separate and alone, each in its own right. If the two stand separately and independently, within the consciousness of a single man, that man will live the fullest and the most tragic of lives. He will find perfection. He will confront imperfection. He will reach to the Absolute and he will writhe in the clutch of the relative. But he will be a full-orbed man.

Returning now to a previous consideration, we will remind ourselves of the fact that science, fresh from its successful encounter with magic, is pressing at the present time to a final tilt with religion.

Magic was never quite able to eliminate religion from human life. Always a prophet would arise,

usually when religion was apparently at last gasp. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Micah, for example, saved religion among the Hebrews. What a succession of spiritual colossi they comprised! Theirs was the domain of the soul, the kingdom of the subjective realm. And because they lived, religion was kept alive in Israel. Later came Paul of Tarsus with his marvellous conception of "*Christ in us the hope of glory.*" A few centuries later, Francis of Assisi. And so on.

The poets were religion's henchmen in the early modern period when science was grappling with magic. Their legacy is our endowment! Shelley, Browning, Tennyson—the mighty British three! And in America the outspoken two—Emerson and Whitman, one the poetic philosopher, the other the philosophic poet. Upon these men and others of their stripe has fallen the task of holding religion's lines against the overwhelming attack of science.

"I say that the real and permanent grandeur of these States must be their religion,
Otherwise there is no real and permanent grandeur."

Since the beginning of this century science has driven back religion from trench to trench. Until to-day, if "the real and permanent grandeur of

these States must be their religion," there is little real and permanent grandeur left!

Consider what has taken place.

Religion deals with man's soul in relationship to the subjective world. Science deals with man's senses in relationship to the objective world. Which is to-day the more compelling to the average man—his soul or his senses?

Science has established itself as authoritative. What science says "goes"! Science has given us "every modern convenience." Science has even revolutionized the "art" of warfare. Science lies back of modern industry, modern business, modern education, modern everything! When science speaks let all the earth keep silence before it!

But science knows nothing about the soul and God excepting as the soul or God tell science about themselves. And science consults no one—not even God, to say nothing of the soul. Science finds things out for itself. If it cannot find a thing out, then that thing cannot (for science) exist. And what cannot exist for science should not, according to the dictum of the cult of objectivity, exist for anyone. Impossible! Let science examine into the question of the soul and God. After due process of examination, science will report. Science reports. It can find no evidence either of the existence of the soul or that of God. There can be, therefore,

scientifically speaking, neither soul nor God. And to speak scientifically in the age of science is to speak pontifically, *ex cathedra,* with authority and not as the poets and mystics!

But here and there arise a scientist or two exclaiming that the "heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork." For this they have the word of a poet who lived several thousand years ago—in the age of magic.

A poet? How naïve! Science speaks for the real universe and asks the poets to adhere to their proper realm. What realm may that be? Why, to be sure, the realm of fantasy, of imagination, of beautiful unrealities. Poets should remain within their own territory. Or else, let them write good sensible rhymes in glorification of science and the good things that science has provided for its children.

With this request, in principle there can be no quarrel. Poets certainly should remain within their own territory.

The poet who wrote that "the heavens declare the glory of God" was a trespasser. Or, perhaps, he had discovered something in the heavens which science has no way of discovering. Perhaps he had reached the point of illumination where even the outer world reflects the Presence of the Absolute. But, if so, he reached that point by no road over

which objective research may travel! For, to the scientist as a scientist, the heavens declare only themselves and their own glory. When the scientist speaks of God in connection with his research he ceases to be a scientist, for science has no way of knowing whether or not God is in the heavens or anywhere else. God must be absolute, else He is not God! But science deals with relatives and is shut off from consideration of the Absolute.

A book, excellently written and breathing a spirit of genuine sincerity, has recently been published under the title, *Science in Search of God.* Finely poised as is the mind of its author, there is in the book a serious confusion of thought—a confusion which it has been the aim of this and the preceding chapter to make clear. The author seems to define God in relative terms and speaks of Him as follows: "God is a power, immanent in the universe. He is involved in the hazard of His creation. He is striving mightily to produce a perfect display, in the world of sense-perception, of his own true nature." How, one pauses to inquire, does the author know this? Not as a scientist, surely.

If God be as above, science assuredly should try to find Him. For, thus, God is *struggling,* "striving mightily"; and is therefore relative to His struggle and not Absolute beyond and above struggle. Such a God is not perfect, nor is He complete. He is

"involved in the hazard of His own creation." To be "involved in hazard" is to be *threatened by danger*. If such be our conception of God, our souls are dupes indeed—for in our souls we feel, we insist, we know, that God is Perfect, and that we may inwardly become one with His Perfection!

If God is "involved in hazard" and "striving mightily," then God is one relative among many relatives—and science may hope some day to find Him. Meanwhile, with fatal certainty, religion will yield up its prerogative to science and, doubtful of the validity of its inner discoveries and conclusions, will submit itself to being led once again captive as the concubine of man's outward experience. In that day there will be no more religion, man's soul will have become a psychological phenomenon, and science will go on seeking its trumped-up deity with the solemnity of a votary of Baal.

Such a time is already at hand! Already has science assumed the task of "finding God"—of finding Him whom men have ever found and always found in the secret place of their souls! Thus science takes over another portfolio. Man's subjective world is now to be governed, administered, and improved by the benign dictatorship of Objectivity!

And what of the spiritual world? It is reduced

to a shadowland. Metaphysics becomes a branch of physics. Spiritual experience must be psychoanalyzed. Subjective broodings, we are warned, are symptoms of introversion. Mysticism is a mechanism of escape from the real to the unreal. The dreamer is neurotic. Poets are pathological; perverts, perhaps, in whom the sex instinct has been repressed. Personality is the expression of glandular activity modified somewhat by conditions of the environment. Religion is "ethics tinged with emotion."

In fairness it should be stated emphatically that all scientists, and probably most of them, do not desire to go to such extreme lengths as those suggested above. But in equal fairness it should also be said that most contemporary scientists "know not what they do." Most of them are instinctively religious men with a keen desire to serve the largest interests of mankind. But when they fail to differentiate between the functions of science and those of religion they are helping, albeit unwittingly, in the overthrow of man's subjective world. They are aiding and abetting the enemy of the Spirit. They are assuming the responsibility that rests solely with man's soul and cannot be borne by man's senses, however acute and however sharpened they may be by the instruments that man has devised.

The average man to-day is losing his capacity to look inward and *find* God there. He is being encouraged to look outward and *seek* God there. But since God as Absolute cannot be discerned by the outward look, men are being taught that God is not Absolute but relative—a struggling God, a striving God, a God involved in hazard, a God groaning and travailing with His own creation, an evolving God, a God inextricably bound up in time! For this is the only kind of God that science can conceive. An absolute, sovereign, perfect, omnipotent, infinite, and eternal God may be found only by the soul in the subjective realm.

Let us hear Tennyson upon this matter. He is speaking in "In Memoriam," of the search for God of which we have also been speaking.

"I found Him not in world or sun,
Or eagle's wings, or insect's eye,
Nor thro' the questions men may try,
The petty cobwebs we have spun:

"If e'er when faith had fall'n asleep,
I heard a voice, 'Believe no more'
And heard an ever-breaking shore
That tumbled in a Godless deep;

"A warmth within the breast would melt
The freezing reason's colder part,
And like a man in wrath the heart
Stood up and answered, 'I have felt.'"

What is the meaning of these lines if not exactly what we have been contending; namely, that it is the heart (we call it the soul) which can say and alone can say of God, "I have found Him"!

In ending this chapter we arrive at the following conclusion: Science by overthrowing magic has vastly and profitably extended man's knowledge and control of the objective world. Its triumphs in this realm are immeasurably important and its future development promises to exceed the limits of our contemporary imagination. This is all clear gain and the race is indebted to science for its splendid service of the common welfare.

The tendency of science, however, to perpetuate the mistake of the prescientific age and to encroach upon the field of subjective experience is alarming and disheartening to those who care seriously for man's full-rounded life.

We are living to-day in a period in which men generally find themselves less and less interested in the spiritual life for its own sake. Religion, mildly encouraged by science and patronized by men of practical affairs, is losing its vitality as a result of the dwindling reality in men's thought of the purely subjective world. Science offers to lead us toward God—but defines God in such a way as to divest Him of any real importance or authority. He is the object of a quest rather than the

subject of an experience. The quest is arduous and the object vague. What wonder that men turn from both quest and object to seek satisfactions where they may more readily and certainly be found!

God may be found in the spiritual world, and only there may He be found. If, then, the spiritual or subjective world be discounted or made of secondary importance, men will at length lose God, utterly, despairingly, hopelessly.

In which event, unless they can smother and put out the fire of inward aspiration (becoming mere machines, mere biochemical mechanisms) they must needs wander about aimlessly, dispiritedly, with fictitious gaiety and optimism, looking for that which they can never hope to find.

Into such a plight have modern men fallen. For this, science must accept the responsibility!

CHAPTER V

RELIGIOUS SURVIVALS IN A SCIENTIFIC PERIOD

It is not in the nature of man to surrender to any foe, whether the adversary be the mechanical force of the outer world or the power of some temporarily dominant phase of human enterprise. For this reason, even in the hour when science seems to have taken full possession of the field, religion (representing man's subjective nature) refuses to capitulate unconditionally!

At the present time there are to be discovered certain *survivals* of religion, the persistence of which proves that the religious nature of man is not entirely inactive.

The most obvious of these is found in the never-say-die anti-scientific reaction. There is much of the heroic in this movement. From the standpoint of sheer defiance it is perfectly glorious! It may not be wise, but it is certainly magnificent.

Much fun has been poked at the anti-Darwinian, anti-evolutionary attitude, so determined and so steadfast in its adherence to the prescientific view

of objective reality. The tragedy of Mr. Bryan's death at the moment when his crusade needed him so desperately has been passed over (except by his followers) with an unfeeling levity.

Yet—consider the dogged audacity of these reactionaries! In the face of proof so convincing that the open mind must needs yield at the first argument, Fundamentalism stands fast for the old faith with all the unconquerable spirit of the famous "thin, red line." Without any hope or expectation (short of some direct intervention from On High) that their crusade can be successful, they persevere unmindful of the odds that lie against them and unregardful of the contumelious derisiveness with which the sophisticated world sneers at their claims. Of such stuff are heroes made! And in the soil of such convictions grow the fibrous roots of character! These contenders for what they believe to be the truths of God in a period when man is persuaded only by the truths of men, represent a precious heritage of the very evolution which they so vociferously deny. Strange paradox! And stranger paradox, that these men should think themselves to be the defenders of religion when in fact they are only defending magic!

For this is obviously the case. Fundamentalism is the uprising of the religious consciousness

against the tyranny of science; but the religious consciousness in Fundamentalism is the victim of a pathetic delusion. Should the antiscientific movement win, not religion but magic would be found holding the captured stronghold.

Yet one may accurately refer to Fundamentalism as a religious survival, because the motive power behind it is distinctly religious. Its aim is that of restoring man's spiritual estate to the place it rightfully should occupy. It is concerned with man's soul. It hates the oppressive arrogance of the outward world; and has thus blindly leagued itself with an ally which is no less unspiritual than science and which in its day was no less tyrannous!

It is at once the folly and the tragedy of Fundamentalism that it is striving to defend religion with the very weapons with which religion was formerly defeated by prescientific magic. Thus, it is in *motive* alone that the Fundamentalist may be said to represent a religious survival. In technique and practice he is no more religious than the avowed materialist. And he is on the whole far less intelligent!

A second and more widespread expression of religious survival into the scientific age is the tendency toward emphasis upon the ethical aspects of idealism. Its catch-phrase is "social service" or "the social gospel."

As a matter of fact, ethics has come generally to be regarded as being the same as religion. Men say, "The golden rule is my religion." They boast of having no creed except that of "service."

Now, when the differentiation between the objective and the subjective worlds ceases to be apparent, and the objective interests become overwhelmingly dominant, it is natural that those who still yearn for some sort of religious expression should supply with a spiritual connotation the terms commonly employed to designate the most generally accepted practices of their time. In other words, when a scientific period is well under way, religion will survive in one aspect as a determined effort to "spiritualize" the outer world. A "tinge of emotion" will be given to practical affairs and this "tinge" will be called "religion."

At the present time, this transmogrification of terms has been quite successfully effectuated. Practical opportunism is embellished and decorated with the habiliments and insignia of spiritual insight. Worship, for example, is defined as being a "right attitude" toward one's fellow men. Prayer is said to be most effective when expressed by kindly deeds. To love one's neighbour as oneself is regarded as being quite as religious an exercise as to love God with one's whole heart and mind and soul and strength—and distinctly more impor-

tant. The soul is looked upon as being the warm, rather comfortable, but very vaguely located seat of "human" feelings. It is supposed that "tolerance" is the sign of a rare spiritual nature, somehow superior in quality to that of the man who staunchly, even fiercely, defends his profoundest convictions against all comers. A man's conduct in business is held to be the gauge by which can be most accurately measured his soul's dimensions. We are assured that it makes no difference what a man's creed may be so long as he does justly, loves kindness, and walks humbly the path of conventional morality. That this is no overstatement can be proved if one will only take the trouble to interview typical representatives of the more enlightened and prosperous citizenry. It is probable that, reading the preceding paragraph, the average well-disposed American would remark: "Why, of course! What is the writer driving at? I don't see anything wrong about that!"

And there is nothing wrong about it except that it betokens a grave confusion in the minds of modern men about the relationship between religion and social ethics.

Religion, let us remember, is an expression of inward or spiritual experience. Ethics is a system of rules governing external conduct. Religion is man's measure of subjective reality. Ethics is man's

standard of values in the objectively social realm. The Golden Rule is not a religious ordinance, it is an idealistic principle of activity in human intercourse.

Now it is doubtful, however, whether anyone can ever come near to a consistent practice of the principle of the Golden Rule who has not within himself a tremendous dynamic of spiritual energy. It is by experience vastly easier to talk about Jesus' ethical principles than to put them into action. So far as is recorded no one has ever been able to consummate those pictures of perfect conduct in outward deeds. So it is nothing short of folly for us to hold up those ideals before men and say to them, "Look at these wonderful teachings, gentlemen! They are the right standards for us all. We may be a bit unsure as to our idea of God, and perhaps we don't all believe in the old creeds, but we can accept these teachings and try to live up to them every day. Let it be our religion to practise the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, and forget about those musty doctrines that no one can understand anyway."

It is nothing short of folly, we must repeat, to lift such a standard before men and ask them to live up to it, unless first we provide them with the spiritual incentive and spiritual dynamic which can be gotten only by "prayer and fasting" in the

solitude of one's secret soul in the presence of the Absolute God!

Yet, we must grant that the motive which prompts modern men to clothe their social aims in religious dress is truly and honestly a spiritual motive. Thus we may admit that the social-ethical emphasis of our day is a religious survival into the age of science. But it is only a survival! Its very poverty of spiritual resourcefulness indicates how devitalized is the soul force of contemporary civilization. While men are to-day more willing to follow the dream of Jesus' perfection than ever they were before, never have they had less of the inner peace and joy and power that were his and which make following him possible. From which it is evident that, desiring outward perfection with such intensity of desire, mankind as at present tending is less equipped to reach its goal than ever! What a grim situation! Its most striking feature is seen in man's dream of world-wide peace which is turned to a nightmare by his demonic persistence in building up with a terrifying determination the frightful organizations and engines of war! Think of it! Never did men talk and pray and plan and plead so passionately for peace. And never did men spend and work and strive and plan so deliberately for war!

What is the reason for this? Simply that man

has made (or tried to make) a religion out of his social ideals while permitting science to drive religion from the only field where it can function—the world in which the soul finds and cleaves to the sovereign God of inner experience.

The enthusiastic slogan maker with his "service above self" and the idealistic lover of world brotherhood are both in the same condemnation. They propose to inaugurate an era of beautiful humanitarian altruism by means of good resolutions sanctified by a few hazy notions borrowed from a religious experience long since vanished and now existing as dwindling survivals into a scientific age. Through science man is to-day expending his whole strength in an effort to create perfection in the outer world. He has abandoned, for the most part, the inner world where alone perfection may be found. And thus, with pitiful self-confidence, he is throwing himself away upon a hopeless quest, crying, "Peace! Peace! When there is no peace"; talking about "service, service," when cutthroat competition and acquisitive materialism are more rampant than ever before! Poor idealistic modern man! Can you not understand how foolish is your flight? Do you not realize that no man's tower of Babel can ever reach to God? Do you not know that the kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation?

But science has almost won the day! Religion is now a sycophant, paying servile homage to its master. The spiritual life in the modern era survives as a Greek slave in the palace of a Roman general—or, perhaps, of a Roman trader!

A third manifestation of religious survival has has been touched upon in a preceding chapter. It may be technically defined as *quasi-scientific subjectivism.*

In Christian Science may be seen the most popular outcropping of this survival instinct. Its very title describes the mood and viewpoint of its founder and of its adherents. The inner and the outer world are merged by it in a synthesis which flatly denies the reality of objective appearance and yet which gives *carte blanche* to those who accept its credo to derive whatever satisfaction they can from the employment of objective means. This they justify by declaring that the outer world is an illusion of the senses and may therefore be employed without serious harm to themselves by spiritually minded people—since sensory satisfaction and pain are alike unreal, and the product of "mortal error."

Such reasoning, couched in language calculated to appeal to man's religious sensibilities, opens the way to a strangely sincere sort of self-delusion.

One may feel all of the inward glow of spiritual experience and at the same time cultivate all of the refinements of materialistic sensationalism. Christian Scientists are on the whole a most attractive type of person. Usually quite prosperous, vigorously healthy, sanguine and optimistic, ready to discuss spiritual matters, they commend themselves to the good graces of a community. Yet, beneath the flourish of their exterior appearance, an unfortunate materialism stands forth at times with disturbing frankness. Their optimism strips down in the end to a cool blandness. Their agreeable smile hides an underlying although unrecognized hardness. Not that they are consciously either bland or cruel. Indeed, the average Christian Scientist is brimful of considerate kindliness. It is only that a philosophy such as theirs tends by its very nature to create a disposition that is ultimately both bland and cruel.

Only blandness could deny the reality of suffering and tragedy in the outer world. Only blandness could accept the "good things of life" and refuse the evil. And only cruelty could speak to the festering bodies and pestilential slums of mankind the word of pious reassurance, "Do not be troubled. All is good and all is God. Deny mortal error and your bodies will be straightway healed.

Deny matter and your slums will disappear." Only a heedless cruelty could address the stricken hearts of men in such terms!

Yet Christian Science is a survival of religion. For the most part, individual Christian Scientists are unconscious of the real nature of the viewpoint which they assume. They are, on the whole, a section of modern humanity which earnestly desires spiritual gifts but does not know where to look for them. They have embraced Christian Science because it sounds religious and because it offers them a way in which they may be "spiritual" and at the same time partake whole-heartedly of the bounties spread by science.

Quasi-scientific subjectivists! Employing the terminology both of science and of religion, and thus missing the meaning of the words that they so glibly use. Scientifico-subjectivists of the "New Thought," speaking of "vibrations," "psychic laws," "subconscious suggestion," "scientific spirituality," "mental law," "cosmic harmony," and so on *ad infinitum*. "Practical Psychology" subjectivists, gathering in hotel ballrooms and public auditoriums, to welter in an atmosphere of forced self-confidence; listening to and repeating phrases faked from the textbooks of authentic science and twisted out of all semblance to their actual definition in order to serve the purposes of

the charlatanry of some irresponsible "lecturer" on "The Secret of Success."

The utter pity of it! That the deep and beautiful movement of the soul toward God should be so misdirected! That the natural aspirations of the human spirit should be so diverted to petty ends! That the souls of men should be so stultified! Yet even these malformations of the subjective world are evidences of the survival of religion!

A fourth phase of religious survival into the scientific period is that which is exemplified by the tendency of certain industrial and commercial leaders to create an atmosphere of spiritual sanctity in their plants and offices. This may be called the cult of Business.

Were it not so insidious in its influence this phase might well be treated with indulgent amusement. The laughable side is, however, hidden to the view save in exceptional cases; for the effect upon our civilization of permitting the relics of religious tradition to fall into the hands of our modern capitalists is already becoming apparent.

Religion in many quarters is to-day assumed tacitly to be a sort of business asset the control of which is to the advantage of whoever is able to purchase it or bargain for its monopolistic use.

There are, especially in America, many employers of labour and executives of corporations who

assiduously cultivate a so-called "religious life" among their employees. Why do they do this? Does anyone believe for a moment that they care for the "religious life" for its own sake? Perhaps, indeed, they do. But it is a tax upon one's credulity to believe it. Far more likely, nay certain, does it seem that they are interested in "religion" because they find that the right sort of "spirituality" makes tractable, efficient, and highly productive workmen and office employees! This they have discovered both from experience and from observation. They themselves are usually ardent churchmen, almost wholly Protestant and members of such churches as are in thorough accord with the existing social order. They know that a good sensible sermon and the company of good wholesome people prepares them on Sunday for more effective work during the ensuing week. That is what they desire and expect from church membership. If it is not available, they are very critical of the minister. Religion, to them, is an aid to efficient production and its value lies in the quantity of economic output that it is able to record.

From observation, this type of pious industrialist realizes that those who belong to the right sort of churches are commonly better fitted for effective work than those who have no church affiliation. Moreover, if "religion" is a vital factor in their

lives they are more conscientious and more dependable.

For these reasons the business and industrial executives who go in for such ambiguous "spirituality" are most ready to aid and assist wholesome church programmes by gifts of money and by donations of time. When employing men and women they ask: "To what church do you belong?"

In rendering a serious estimate of the above-described cult of Business, we must remember first that the sole and exclusive function of religion is that of a technique for the development of inward experience. Religion has to do only with man's relationship to God within his secret soul. *And religion is an end itself!* It cannot be made a means to an end, else it languishes and ultimately dies!

When, therefore, religion is treated as if it were simply one more instrumentality by which to produce and sell goods—as if it were a sort of silent partner in commercial transactions—it withers to a ghost of its true appearance. Religion is not an instrumentality, it is the measure of man's inner life. Religion is not a partner in business, it is a man's whole spiritual business. It is not primarily an aid to man's work, it is man's total work in the realm of the soul!

And yet we must admit that the cult of Business represents a survival of religion. There is a touch-

ing sincerity beneath the crass commercialism of these pious business men! They cannot give up religion. They *must* maintain some contact with the subjective world. And thus they adapt what they mistakenly call "religion" to the necessities of the fierce warfare of modern economic competition. They try to "spiritualize" the materialistic goals of commodity production and exchange. They ask God to help them make money; and having made money, they give some of it back to God! They support churches and missionaries, and all that they ask in return is that the ministers and missionaries help them by "spiritual" encouragement in the fight for economic gain.

Milton's phrase comes back to mind: "Blind mouths!" How can these men speak the language of God when their mouths are full of the *patois* of "success"?

A fifth aspect of religious survival is that seen in the average well-to-do congregation of the modern so-called "liberal" church. This aspect is very closely associated with the cult of Business. Indeed, it may be said to represent a subsidiary phase of the general business phase.

A liberal church, according to the usual definition, is an organization which, in the name of religion, carries on a programme of preaching and teaching divested of all traditional doctrine. Lib-

eral churches accept the scientific formulæ and encourage their constituents to turn away from the old beliefs and creeds. Varying widely in the intensity of their modernistic propaganda, these churches appeal for support to those who can no longer subscribe to the views taught by orthodox Christianity. (There are liberal synagogues, also, which answer in general the same description as that of the liberal Christian churches.) Much of the emphasis in the liberal pulpits is put upon the redirection of people's thought into legitimately scientific channels; and upon intellectual or ethical culture. A great and valuable service is rendered by such liberalism to the individuals and communities in which it is preached. But, according to any valid definition of religion, how can the liberal churches be said to stand for anything more than a religious survival? The stress is all upon *objective experience*—scientific thinking, cultivated æsthetic taste, developed moral discrimination, wider political horizons, loftier economic ideals, a larger sense of social responsibility. Great themes, indeed, are these for a preacher in the modern world! But do they touch deeply upon religion? They do not.

They scarcely touch religion at all! As a matter of fact, they are *substitutes* for religion. They are subjects for discussion. But religion is never a sub-

ject for discussion. Religion is the discussion of a Subject! The difference is as great as is the difference between man's outer and his inner world! It is only when this difference—the difference between relativity and the Absolute—is forgotten or ignored, that such a phenomenon as that of modern Christian or Jewish liberalism can show itself.

And yet—liberalism is a survival of religion. The liberal ministers and laymen greatly desire and yearn for the Kingdom of God. But they are like the former Pharisees who cried, "Lo here! Lo there!" and were reminded by Jesus that the Kingdom of God was *within* them!

Well-intentioned, cultivated, sincere, aspiring men with minds and souls all confused! You will never find your way to God along yonder beckoning highway.

A sixth manifestation of religious survival is found in the cult of Patriotism. This is the worship of one's country in place of the Absolute and Sovereign God! Of all cults that flourish to-day this is the one perhaps which weaves the most insidious spell about men's lives. It holds men fast! It fills them with a vast and surging passion! It calls them out to battle fields where they perish gloriously in its name! It compels sacrifices beyond all other cults. It offers rewards more prized than money or success or love of women. It is the Great

Moloch of our time, as it was in the time of the Romans! *"Dulce et decorum est, pro patria mori!"* Those who die in war for their country are the shining heroes of patriotic adulation.

It is patriotism which keeps the human species from living in decent peace upon the face of the planet. In an age of science one might expect so unscientific an attitude to be abandoned. But no! Instead of being abandoned, patriotism seems to be gaining in strength. National lines are to-day more sharply drawn than they ever were in the prescientific eras. Men are apparently more touchy about national honour and more concerned about national security than at almost any previous time in history. War is to-day the obsession of statesmen.

How can this be explained? There are doubtless various possible explanations and we shall here venture one.

We venture the explanation that the recrudescence and the growth of patriotic feeling are due to the waning influence in the world of vital religion.

In elaborating this theory let us make plain our conviction that this is *not* due to the failure of institutional religion to function properly in international relations. Religion never of itself caused war or brought peace. Religion itself has

nothing to do with either war or peace. It is sheer folly to attribute the present warlike mood of some men and the present pacific mood of others to the absence or presence of true religion from or in their souls. Some very belligerent men have also been very religious, and some very peaceful men have been decidedly irreligious. No! When we claim that the growth of patriotic feeling is due to the waning influence of religion, we mean something far more subtle than that if men were more religious they would be less likely to go to war.

What we mean is that in the absence of a profound and compelling experience of God in the soul, men will seek to compensate for this absence by discovering some other profound and compelling inward experience. And patriotism offers men this compensation.

War is a by-product of patriotism. To be sure, it is often precipitated by economic, racial, or other rivalries. But unless patriotic fervour lies dormant, ready to rush upward and fill the whole consciousness of a nation, the misunderstandings and rivalries between political units (nations) will of necessity be settled and adjusted by conciliation or agreement. To start and carry on a war, a diplomat or statesman must have a hotly patriotic people behind him. The existence of a cult of

Patriotism is the one and only obstacle in the way of international peace.

Let men but find their souls' full satisfaction in a stirring and invigorating contact with God in the subjective world, and they will never be aroused to spiritual frenzy by patriotic propaganda.

Professor William James asked for "a moral equivalent for war." This is not needed. The world is crammed with *moral* equivalents for war. What is needed is *a spiritual equivalent for patriotism!*

For patriotism is the outstanding survival of religion into the age of science. Only religion itself can reduce emotional patriotism to the obliteration that it deserves. The worship of Moloch is fascinating, convincing, glorious. But the worship of the Sovereign and Absolute God is more so. Patriotism calls out the response of man's soul to a great spiritual challenge. But religion calls out the response of man's soul to a great spiritual victory! Challenge or victory! Moloch or God! A marvellous Relativity or a tremendous Absolute! Which? The answer to this question is involved in the greater question: Shall man recover religion?

We are now done with our consideration and analysis of the various religious survivals into the age of science.

Religion is not dead, but religion is anæmic! Science has not been able to do away with man's

spiritual cravings, but science has been able to weaken religion and thus reduce it to a position of secondary importance in modern life.

In its survivals, however, religion proves itself to be as yet not beyond recovery. But its recovery is conditioned upon the willingness of men to rediscover and to accept the critical dilemma upon the horns of which mankind is impaled. The subjective world must regain its reality in the recognition of the race. The objective world must retire from its place of primacy in man's regard. The inner and the outer realms must stand over against each other, opposed, hostile, contradictory in every particular. Man must take up his cross and carry it to Golgotha! Upon Golgotha he must be crucified. He must die and be buried. He must rise from the dead and ascend into heaven. This he must do —if he would continue to be man!

Perhaps he will not wish to be man any more. In which event—he will become something other than man.

CHAPTER VI

SUBSTITUTES FOR RELIGION IN A SCIENTIFIC PERIOD

HAD science been able entirely to eliminate from man's consciousness the yearning of his soul for subjective reality, religious survivals would have by now disappeared. We have seen, however, that religious survivals are frequent and that they do not appear as yet to have lost their hold. Despite their lack of depth and their grave limitations, such tendencies as those of Fundamentalism, Social Idealism, Quasi-scientific Subjectivism (Christian Science and the like), the cults of Business and Patriotism, have still a strong grip upon contemporary life. For they represent to modern man the nearest approach to real religiousness that, in a period of scientific dominance, he is able to make. Were he to come more closely to religion, he would be under the necessity of dethroning the objective world of science and reëstablishing the mutual equality of the objective and the subjective as fields of experience. He would, thus, be forced to re-

establish himself upon the horns of the dilemma from which science (both theoretical and applied) has offered to rescue him.

How strangely stubborn man is in his refusal either to become a thoroughgoing materialist and abandon religion, or to "gird up his loins" and live in his twofold world with candid and courageous realism! He must have religion—but refuses to have it on the only terms upon which it may be had. And what are those terms? They offer a choice. Man may have religion by becoming completely a mystic and abandoning science. Or he can have it by accepting both the outer world of science and the inner world of religion; and living in both worlds as a full-rounded human being. The price he must pay for maintaining himself in the two worlds is that of sublime tragedy. The perfect inner world and the imperfect outer world will war in him one against the other. But of this he must take no account. It is for man as man to endure the tragedy in order that he may be—man!

But man is loath to pay the penalty of his manhood. And modern man, fascinated by the allurements of the outer world and persuaded by science, has thought that his spiritual needs might be served by a religion divested of its more drastic and terrifying attributes. He has thus kept religion alive by cultivating certain survival forms which we have

reviewed in the previous chapter. He has kept religion alive—but scarcely so. Within at most three more generations religion at the present rate will have passed out of civilization!

The acceleration of religion's passing may be timed by a consideration of the rapidity with which certain *substitutes* for religion are replacing religious survivals at the present moment. A substitute for religion is employed as soon as a survival of religion has lost its appeal.

The progress of events can be charted in some such summary as this: In a generation designated I religion is found to be flourishing: In generation III religion has entered the survival stage. In generation IV religious survivals are being supplanted by substitutes for religion. In generation VII science controls the field so thoroughly that man no longer feels the need even for religious substitutes. Thus, within seven generations, religion will have gone from a position of power by gradual decline to a place of humiliation until it has ceased at length to function in human life even as a memory. Mr. H. G. Wells has drawn an appealing picture of such a development in his *Men Like Gods*.

That such a course has never as yet in all history proceeded to its completion is due, no doubt, to the toughness of resistance found in man's subjective

life. But it should be remembered that never before has science presented man's objective world to him with such convincing persuasiveness; nor has science ever so completely undertaken to dominate human affairs. There seems to be no good reason for doubting that, left to itself, the tendency of mankind's development as indicated to-day will within not more than two centuries have led the whole race (save only in certain isolated sections) away from all consciousness even of the existence of the subjective realm. Thus would be achieved the utopia of objective science! Man would have been made into the image of the Earth. No doubt, a very beautiful image! But with the face of God scrubbed out!

We seem at this stage to have reached the point designated in our chart as generation IV. That is, we are now in the period when religious survivals, although still widespread, are giving way to substitutes for religion.

Of all the substitutes, the one called "hard work" is perhaps the most generally respected.

Work has been man's salvation. It is his most satisfactory means of expressing his inner desire. Out of his subjective brooding he has come with hands and brain all ready to do something or to make something with the materials supplied by nature. Work, when it is creative, is the spirit of

man breathing upon the clay of his outer world. It is God in man giving form to formlessness and bringing order out of disorder.

In the most ancient traditions work stands out as the crown and crest of human achievement. Even abstract thought is glorified by those who toil to produce its shapes in concrete imagery. Plato's Republic and Augustine's City of God become the task of those who love their spiritual outlines. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address gives opportunity for men to labour upon the creation of a "new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal." Beethoven's Ninth Symphony calls men to the achievement, through tedious effort, of a technique skilful enough to transpose its unheard majesty into music to which the ear may listen and the heart respond. The design conceived in man's soul is born through man's travail! Work is man's solace, his boon, and his victory!

But work, so understood, is a very different thing from work seen as a substitute for spiritual experience. The former *is* spiritual experience expressed objectively; the latter is objective experience flattened out into routine. The former is a search for expression; the latter is a flight from expression. The former is art; the latter is drudgery.

Not even if a man claims to "love his work" can we, by such testimony, conclude that he is an artist. Yet all workmen are artists whose labour is the result of their soul's necessity. But a man may love his work as a shipwrecked sailor loves the spar to which he clings. Work may represent to a man the means of escape from his soul's shipwreck. In which case his work is not an art. It is a substitute!

It seems not unfair to our highly organized industrial system to state that it represents in its more important phases an effort to escape from spiritual reality.

Consider it first from its own standpoint. Do the men and women in industry, as a whole, regard their labour as an artist must regard his? Do they find such joy in their task as makes the task appear to them a truly spiritual effort? Or is their workmanship dull, drab, and uninspiring?

To be sure, there are those (referred to in the previous chapter) who consciously endeavour to "bring religion into business" or "to spiritualize the daily task." But this is not what we mean. The cult of Business is not religion—it is a survival of religion. Neither is work, even at its best, in itself religious. Work at its best is art—and art is religion symbolized objectively. While to "spiritualize the day's work" is neither religious nor artistic!

Consciously, or even *conscientiously*, to try to introduce an element of so-called "spirituality" into one's task is exactly tantamount to trying to introduce emotion into one's love-making. Emotion is the *cause* of honest love-making. If it is not present love-making is insincere. In like manner spirituality is the cause of true work. If it is not present work is merely routine activity which no amount of "spiritualization" can redeem. We must therefore insist that to "bring religion into business" is a sorry admission that business has become inwardly sterile.

Let us come back again to our statement that the industrial system of the present era represents an effort to escape from spiritual reality. We were considering it from its own standpoint.

Experience with those engaged in business or industry, both men and women, leads the writer to the conviction that, with some outstanding exceptions, people to-day are hard at work to get away from the tormenting consciousness of great spiritual lack! What is more, the writer finds that they are, for the most part, succeeding very well in their attempt. Their work is so completely absorbing their attention and so utterly using up their resources that they have neither time nor energy left to "invite their souls" nor much capacity left to understand what the word "soul" really

means. They are making rapid headway against their subjective desires. Swiftly what was once a potentially spiritual man is changed into an efficiently materialistic salesman of commodities. Thenceforward he sells commodities with a passion almost pious, save that the attribute of piety has long since departed him. Suddenly from the chrysalis of wistfully introspective youth emerges a man whose "practical business sense" soon lifts him to great executive responsibility. Quickly a romantic girl is transformed into a "sensible" housekeeper or a calculating aspirant for social prestige. Why and how do such things happen? They happen to people whose work is for them an escape from the spiritual world—a substitute for religion.

Or here are those engaged in more intellectual pursuits. Is their work an art? That professor—is he an artist? That writer—is he an artist? That producer of plays—is he an artist? That minister of "religion"—is he an artist?

Some of them are true artists indeed! And their work is as glorious as a crucifixion. They wear a crown, those men of art, and it is a crown of thorns! But they scarcely belong in a scientific period, although some of them are scientists of note! Some of them are scientists who understand the limitations of science (how it dare not en-

croach upon the realm of the Absolute)—and who yet bring forth from their spiritual treasure certain work of scientific research which is their effort to create in the restricted field of objectivity some form of thought that may express their deep soul's hunger! Such men are artists. But they are alien to the spirit of the time.

Does one for a moment believe that the so-called "intellectual pursuits" are to-day enlisting, in any large measure, those to whom work is more than a way to earn a living and to escape the inner world? To earn a living and to escape the inner world! Do these two go together? From the inner or subjective standpoint these two do most assuredly go together. Economic security and spiritual obliteration—they are twin phases of a single state of mind: a phase of seeking and a phase of flight. "Let me have my body's needs," cries the first phase. "Let me flee from my soul's demands," entreats the other. Together, they succeed in keeping modern men and women frantically busy!

An artist seeks to satisfy his soul's demands; then, if his body's needs can also be satisfied, he is content. But he would scorn to work merely in order to keep from starving. Rather, he tries to keep from starving that he may keep at his beloved work!

The contemporary worker, on the other hand,

seeks first to satisfy his body's wants; then, if he has any time left after his "living" has been "earned" he either finds more work to do, lest his soul should make itself heard—or he discovers another substitute for religion which may be what is euphoniously miscalled "recreation."

Recreation is a word of which the derivation is easily discovered even by those whose Latin is lame. It was formerly used to define those pursuits in which men and women and children released themselves from the tension of a more or less arbitrary discipline and relaxed in games or sports or perhaps in quiet enjoyment of music or a play. Recreation, properly understood, is relaxation for rebuilding. In recreation people supposedly let themselves become more simple, elemental, child-like indeed, than they usually must be in civilized life. By means of recreation the individual restores the balance of life, somewhat disturbed by serious pursuits too long and uninterruptedly followed. The value of recreation to society is that it produces good humour and fellowship among its members.

In an age when religion and science should be found proceeding *pari passu,* equal factors in man's experience, work would be an art and play a foil to art. By this is meant that the workman in off hours would express his inner life in such ob-

jective ways as to make his recreation stand off against his work as a contrast in form but not in values. A composer of serious symphonies would, for recreation, compose fantasies; or if he deserted composition would perhaps learn to play upon the flute. A stone mason, for recreation, would cultivate an interest in games that required much the same sort of training as masonry—games of mathematical or geometric character. A gardener would probably find recreation in a study of animals or rocks, watching them in his hours of leisure. A politician would be likely to read history for relaxation, or detective stories; and for exercise, engage in competitive sports. A theologian would possibly discover his most thorough release from serious metaphysical research and counsel in the works of such skeptics as Voltaire or in the literature of science; and would enjoy long walks in the country. Perhaps this theory cannot be carried quite so far as suggested above; but in principle it is undoubtedly true. When a man's work is in fact the objectification of his subjective experience, his play is bound to be an expression of the same inward disposition. It is significant, is it not, that the Europeon peasants of a rapidly vanishing epoch carried out in their folk dances and songs the motif of the fields and stables in which they worked, and of the villages where they were

born and lived and died. Work, to the peasants of those days, was a spontaneous outpouring. To them both labour and recreation were the natural expression of their deeply ingrained folk soul. Life, to them, was a whole; tragic, harshly so, but also joyous in the sense that joyousness is both tragic and exultant, a surge of the inner man to a tremendous leap of vitality over the cataracts of passion.

How flavourless, how paltry, in comparison with the play of the more inwardly robust periods, appears much of our modern recreation which is so commonly employed as a substitute instead of as a vehicle for religious expression.

We have suggested that when religion and science should be found proceeding *pari passu* work would be an art and play a foil to art. We may now suggest further that, when work is a substitute for subjective interests, play is a reflection of the same substitutionary preoccupation. It is, therefore, to be expected that men who are engaged in an effort to forget their inner world through immersion in objective activity will in off hours continue to seek such forgetfulness in the various sorts of recreation which they choose.

The chief types of recreation found in contemporary society are competitive sports, games played with cards, dancing, automobile driving,

hunting or fishing, and the "movies." Competitive sports may be engaged in directly or enjoyed from observation.

Every one of these recreational types is, in itself, not only innocuous but actually of constructive value. Only when one or another of them is employed as a mechanism of escape from the profounder appeals of the inner life may it be regarded as spiritually debilitating.

The growing interest in athletics is, physically, a most wholesome development, especially as boys and girls are taught by the playing of games, not only the rules of personal hygiene, but also the technique of social adjustment. The flight of thousands from the cities to the country in good weather is exactly what is needed by those who live in the congestion of urban centres. The relaxation of an evening with cards is valuable. Dancing, when a spontaneous expression of rhythmic feeling, is creative. Outdoor life under primitive conditions restores balance and relaxes nervous strain. Motion pictures supply a real need in the oftentimes parched lives of underprivileged men and women.

This having been said, however, one must qualify his approval by a consideration of modern recreation from the standpoint of solid subjective values. As in the case of contemporary industrial-

ism, so in the case of contemporary recreation, we must ask: What tendency does this particular phase of our social practice seem to illustrate?

There are undoubtedly a great many adults, as well as children, for whom the form of recreation which they choose is a spontaneous expression of a truly creative aspiration. There are others who, while not engaging in spiritually creative play, cultivate some form of athletic sport for purposes of physical health or nervous reconstruction. But the most generous allowance for all who can be included in the above categories will not embrace the large majority of those who to-day are well-nigh frantic in their pursuit of recreational diversions. The very fact that amusement promotion has become one of the most profitable of commercial undertakings seems to bear out the belief that, on the whole, modern men and women are engaged in play as a serious endeavour to fill an emptiness in their lives and to release themselves from the disturbing recollection of spiritual capacities allowed to atrophy.

As a manifestation of the subjective poverty to which men are being reduced by the objective overemphasis, the amount of golf that is played, of baseball and football that is watched, of time that is devoted to bridge, of effort that is thrown into dancing, of emotional reserve that is expended

upon the "movies," is exceedingly significant. While the furious driving about on no apparent errand save that of finding a substitute for quiet and contemplation, and the quest after new devices with which to "kill time," give pause to one who regards as of importance the expansion of man's inward life to a larger circumference.

Yet, such a situation is the natural result of the sort of attitude toward work that contemporary man has learned to assume. When one is taught to labour primarily to earn his living, he will seek in play the compensation for those hours spent in uninspiring toil. His recreation will be a search after forgetfulness. And when he is encouraged to discount the reality of a truly spiritual life, he will discount in periods of relaxation, as well as in hours of work, the spiritual qualities which alone are able to lend a creative value to play.

We must aver, therefore, that contemporary recreation has lost the prime attribute of recreation, and has become a substitute for work. Since, furthermore, work is to-day so largely a substitute for inward occupation, we may conclude that modern play is in no small measure a substitute for a substitute for religion. Should man's leisure be occupied to any increased extent in such superficial relaxations as are now so generally employed, the

extinction of religious awareness would doubtless follow with remarkable acceleration. The problem is serious and takes its place as an aspect of the larger problem to the discussion of which this chapter is devoted.

The Romans, at a certain period during the decline of the Empire, gave men bread and gave them circuses; seeking thus to satisfy the deep hunger which a spiritually sterile civilization could in no other manner fill. Is it not possibly true that to-day, in a scientific civilization, the same inward sterility is tacitly acknowledged when, in lieu of bread and circuses as a gift, the same substitutes for religion are being offered for pay? Surely, the decline of man as a spiritual being is eloquently attested by the manner in which he has become willing, nay eager, to accept for subjective loss so trivial a compensation!

We have devoted so much time and space to a description of the substitutes for religion—work and play—that the remaining ones must be passed over somewhat summarily. They are, however, no less significant as markers, so to speak, by which to gauge the declension of man's inward powers under the influence of the objective world which science has made dominant over human life in our era.

It is, of course, well known that the mystical

and the erotic tendencies in man at certain points make contact; and that hyper-mysticism more often than not goes hand in hand with a highly charged eroticism! It is not strange, therefore, that erotic sensualism should have entered the field of contemporary life as one of the staple substitutes for religion.

Love as felt between men and women may be, and often is, a true symbol or objectification of a profound spiritual yearning. It may be said in all seriousness that at a certain stage of growth "the love of a man for a maid" is the most developed outward expression of the love of man for God. And at all stages, if the sex relationship has been kept upon a level above mere physical desire and psychological lust, the love between men and women remains as a living sacrament of the spiritual Perfection which is created when man finds God within his secret soul.

Like work and play at their best, love is the effort of man's religious nature to realize itself in the outer world. Like work and play, also, love very readily may be employed as a substitute for religion. And the result, when this is done, is equally unsatisfactory.

Erotic sensualism represents the outcome of man's attempt to use love as a religious substitute. It is not, as sometimes we are told, a fling-back to

paganism or savagery; for pagans and savages did not stultify sex by misusing it as an escape from a deeper emotion. Pagans and savages were erotic, to be sure; but their eroticism was frankly religious. In all of its nakedness it expressed their honest striving after union with the spiritual world. Eroticism was a rite among pagans and savages; and if its appearance in this guise is revolting to our more cultivated sensibilities, we must remember that paganism and savagery in all of their manifestations must of necessity seem unpleasant to us. We have passed beyond the savage and the pagan phases and cannot possibly return to them.

Modern eroticism is original with us, as is shown by the fact that it is divorced from religion and is, universally, discovered to be a means of escape from the soul's profounder appeal.

It is not with erotic sensualism as a social phenomenon, connected with the increase of marital unhappiness leading to divorce, that we are here concerned. Rather we are interested in it as a spiritual phenomenon, connected with man's desire to flee from religion and leading ultimately to a coolly biological view of the sex relation. Its social consequences are, to be sure, temporarily confusing: but in the long run would doubtless issue in an entirely objective view of love, thus permitting

science to dictate its terms upon a basis of eugenic mating.

Meanwhile, eroticism offers an effective substitute for the abandoned spiritual experience. It appeals strongly to the imagination. It creates emotional tension. It elevates life above the commonplaceness of routine. It insuires an agreeable disposition toward poetic expression. It causes its devotees to forget space-time. It seems to carry them out upon wings of ecstatic self-realization. It exhilarates and makes glad the entire personality. It quickens vitality, and renews the feeling of youth. It stimulates the physical organism. It even sharpens the intellect.

All these things does erotic sensualism do—*for a time*. And these are the things, moreover, that religion does. But whereas religion continues to result in all these effects, eroticism, at a certain point, is met by a reaction.

At a certain point erotic sensualism begins to undo all that it has previously accomplished. It dulls the imagination. It causes an emotional letdown. It becomes commonplace and flaccid. It ceases to inspire the poetic feeling. It enslaves its devotees in space-time. Its wings drop off and it falls heavily to the ground. It demoralizes the personality. It depresses vitality and accelerates

the coming of old age. It makes sluggish the physical organism. It destroys the intellect.

In this destructive ultimate effect eroticism proves its complete difference from religion. Like all substitutes for reality, erotic sensualism finally brings disillusionment. And yet, as a substitute for authentic spiritual experience, it is rapidly spreading to a wider employment in contemporary life. The disillusionment which follows in its wake can be used by science as a means to the extinction of all emotional desire. This end having been achieved, science can set up a system of sex relationships in which mere objective efficiency will have supplanted the subjectively disturbing confusions and contradictions of passionate love.

Or, refusing to follow science to its logical end, mankind may restore religion to its rightful place and let sex love be, as it should, one of the sacramental objectifications of an inward desire and an inward consummation.

Another substitute for religion is out-and-out cynicism. As Fundamentalism stands as the most heroic of the religious survivals, cynicism is certainly the most heroic substitute for religion. The honest cynic must needs be equipped with a brave heart! It requires courage to turn away from life with a mocking smile.

Instead of hard work and vapid play, instead of

ultimately disillusioning eroticism, the cynic accepts disillusionment as the fundamental structure of his experience and builds his life upon it. He expects nothing and asks nothing. He seeks to escape the inner world by denying the value of the outer world as well. He is, spiritually and practically, a nihilist.

The cynic is, as a rule, one to whom the subjective realm was once especially appealing. He is potentially an unusually spiritual man, unusually sensitive to inner stimuli. But, convinced that the inward vista is that of a mirage, he averts his gaze and looks about him at what science calls "the real world." But the "real world" of science does not attract him. If he cannot have a soul, he cares nothing for the privilege of possessing a body. Forthwith, then, he repudiates the body in revenge for the loss of his soul. Thenceforward, he makes bitter fun of life and mocks at the race of men.

The cynic is misunderstood and despised by the hard worker and the refugees of recreation. He is pitied by the sensualist. Science fears him because he will not take science seriously. He is, indeed, a man without a country. Denied the inner world, he rejects the outer, and lives as an expatriate upon the earth. Yet he is a man of bravery and has chosen a substitute for religion which, at the least, is worthy of a hero!

The four substitutes for religion that we have thus far considered are employed, usually, without a recognition on the part of those who accept them, of their substitutionary character. That is, they appear to their devotees as perfectly valid in their own right. The hard worker, the sports and amusement fiend, the philanderer or sensualist, and the cynic would be likely to deny with vociferous resentment that they were running away from religion, or, indeed, from anything whatever. They would probably defend their scheme of life and argue for it in strong terms. The writer has encountered their arguments upon all manner of occasions; and he has yet to meet a follower of any of the previously noted substitutionary pursuits who would consent to the assertion that he was a fugitive from the appeal of his spiritual nature.

There are, however, two substitutes which have been frankly and consciously devised as an escape from the religious command. Their apostles regard themselves as rescuers, and their converts feel that they have been saved from a deplorable enslavement to superstition and ignorance.

These substitutes are economic materialism and psychoanalysis. The economic materialist is one whose reasoned theory of human existence is based upon the assumption that man lives by bread alone. His argument from this hypothesis follows in due

order: Since man lives by bread alone, he will most fully live when he is supplied with the most bread. It is therefore the task of society to see to it that men have plenty of bread. Whatever interferes with man's supply of bread or with his capacity to eat it must be sternly suppressed. Religion interferes. For this reason, religion must go.

The logic is perfectly sound, provided the assumption be accepted. Religion does unquestionably interfere both with man's supply of bread and with his capacity to enjoy it. The interference begins at the point where objective satisfactions tend to outweigh subjective appreciations. When man's economic interests have become to him preponderant, religion steps in to correct the balance. This, however, cannot be justified if man's chief end, nay his greatest obligation, is to eat bread!

Economic materialists are found among all races of men, and the economic systems which they advocate and often are able to set up vary widely in character. In the modern or scientific era the two major systems are those of Capitalism and Socialism. We need not, in this discussion, enter upon a study of these systems; for their structure is intricate and is, moreover, modified to a certain extent within the ambit of separate national boundaries. For our purposes it is necessary only to refer to their existence and to discover to what

extent the theory of economic materialism is objectified in them.

Both the capitalistic and the socialistic systems contain, in certain phases, an element of religious survival. We have remarked upon the habit of some industrialists and business men of introducing a vaguely subjective quality to their enterprises, calling the process "spiritualizing the day's work" or "putting religion into business." We could easily find, also, in the literature and propaganda of Socialism, a similar trend. The phrase, "Jesus was the first Socialist," is an equivalent to the similar phrase, "Jesus was the first Rotarian." Each declaration assumes that religion (personalized in Jesus) gives a quasi-authoritative status to the system that is advocated. Each represents a misty recollection of the fact that, essentially, all work and all economic systems derive from man's need to objectify his spiritual experience. But each, on the other hand, comes at the matter from the wrong end and thus betokens a religious survival rather than a real interest in religion as such.

We are concerned, in the present discussion, however, with that attitude toward economic status and organization which is frankly anti-religious. And such an attitude is discovered to-day most generally among the so-called "radical" groupings. Conservative capitalistic influence is

avowedly on the side of religion, whether it is honestly so or not. Radical socialistic influence, on the contrary, is avowedly opposed to religion. Whether it be religion in its subjective roots or religion in its objective efflorescence, Communism is against it. Economic materialism hates and despises both spirituality and its outer manifestations. In Russia under the Communist régime, and in the Communist parties elsewhere, are located the dynamical forces which would eagerly accept any favourable opportunity to establish their economic credo as the orthodox plan of man's salvation. Salvation from what? Salvation from religion! Salvation from subjectivity! Salvation from God, whom the economic materialist regards as at once a nonexistent fiction and the chief enemy of the human species!

Whether Communism, as a materialistic doctrine, will ever join hands with an increasingly materialistic Capitalism to dethrone man's soul, is a matter for conjecture. There are indications that seem to point in that direction. It may be, however, that eventually both Communism and Capitalism will evolve into new and as yet unpredictable systems of economic order; and that meanwhile a renewal of religion among men will have rendered materialism obsolete both as a theory of life and as an applied institutional code.

The last substitute for religion which we shall consider is that popularly known as "psychoanalysis." This is, in the so-called "intellectual circles," the most generally accepted device for the contraception of the religious nature.

Psychological analysis proceeds upon the assumption that man's subjective experience can be taken apart, so to speak, in much the same way as that in which a mechanism like a watch may be taken apart. Here is a person of thirty-five years, for example, whose inner life is obviously out of order. Perhaps, indeed, the subjective disorder has objectified itself in a serious physical malady. The analyst begins by asking questions, most of them apparently quite irrelevant. Gradually he learns the most intimate facts about the patient, and is able to create a picture or diagram a chart of the patient's life. He then sets about to trace effects back to their subjective causes. In many instances he can restore the patient to normal health by locating the seat of the disturbance and by helping to eradicate the primary difficulty.

The technique of such analysis is complicated, and psychoanalytic treatment must be delicately and cautiously applied. Within the limits of sound judgment, and restricted to the sphere wherein strictly psychological maladjustments may be traced, this method of mental therapy is of very

great value. It is only when the method becomes a "fad" that it commences to result unfavourably. But when it is made a substitute for religion it proves itself to be, subjectively and socially, the most destructive agency to which modern man has been thus far introduced!

Yet, of all the substitutes, it is probably the most plausible. With its convincing vocabulary, its well-sounding terms such as "fixation," "complex," "neurosis," "libido," and so forth, psychoanalysis makes shift to relieve man of all anxiety about his soul's welfare. Its employment of words is as mystical and vague as the esoteric writings of a mediæval saint! Its failure to define its terms is as egregious as that of the average evangelical preacher. Its claims to omniscience remind one of an ecclesiastical potentate. It comes forward with a promise to accomplish everything that spiritual cultivation has ever accomplished; and to do so with scientific precision. Indeed, it offers to explain religion as a sort of escape mechanism from reality and discourages religious practices as being inimical to the health of the "psyche."

The writer is most anxious to be fair in this description, and desires to reassert his conviction that, duly restricted by judgment and by a truly scientific caution, psychoanalysis is a great boon. He himself tries to apply its technique to his own

work with individuals who come to him for help. But the point that he is endeavouring to make is simply that, regarded as a substitute for religion and as a key to man's spiritual experience, psychoanalysis is utterly destructive. The malevolent influence that it has exerted upon those who have embraced it unscientifically shows it to be a demoralizing force of perilous potentiality. Instead of curing the neuroses of sufferers by a process of character construction, it "cures" them by enticing their imagination toward a complete breach with all civilized standards. The "cure" is often more deplorable than the ailment. Moreover, in explaining away the religious aspect of experience, psychoanalysis deprives men of their best heritage of ideals. And this it does without honestly and straightforwardly teaching its pupils that the subjective world is unreal and that they must live exclusively in the objective world. Far from this, psychoanalysis makes the inner world more alluring than ever (with its emphasis upon sexual phases) and encourages its devotees to live their subjective lives to the full, only charging them to remember that if they do so they must tolerate no "inhibitions" or "repressions."

Brought down into cool print, psychoanalysis as a substitute for religion is in fact the apostleship of a new savagery! Its gospel is that of the jungle.

Its heaven is a place where the "libido" can express itself unhampered by restraint. Its hell is civilized society.

In its substitutionary capacity, psychoanalysis manifests itself as the lowest ebb of spiritual decline to which the tidal flow of modern life has gone. To use a figure from Matthew Arnold, it has exposed in all their ugliness "the naked shingles of the world."

With the consideration of psychoanalysis as a substitute for religion, we have reached the conclusion of our review; ready, perhaps, to embark upon a more positive undertaking in an effort to recover what Principal L. P. Jacks once described as "the lost radiance of religion."

But prior to setting out upon this adventure (for adventure indeed it will be!) we ought to establish for ourselves a base from which not only to go, but to which we may at any time speedily return.

This base, *a quo* and *ad quem,* will be represented by the statement with which our consideration began in the first chapter, namely: *Man reaching toward his best discovers himself to be living in two worlds, the objective and the subjective. Facing this situation, he finds himself upon the horns of a critical dilemma.*

The recovery of religion must be the consequence of a recovery of the dilemma! Only so may

religion ever become again a ponderable force in human life. Man must acknowledge and accept the tragic necessity to which he has been called—the tragic necessity of living in two worlds which war within him for dominance and which are at odds one with the other.

So long as man refuses to face this necessity—so long as he tries to evade it—he will suffer the atrophy of one or the other side of his nature. In our time the tendency is strongly toward the neglect and decay of his subjective nature. Science, having conquered magic, has almost succeeded in dispossessing religion. The issue of our times lies between those who would encourage science to further encroachment, and those who would not only keep science in its present position but would repel science until it should withdraw to its own legitimate field.

It will rest with the remainder of our study to present arguments looking toward a more general acceptance of the original thesis; and to suggest what may be the reasonably expected outcome among civilized men, when they shall have restored religion to its place and when they shall have learned to live in two worlds with the intelligent courage which should characterize so wonderful a species as that to which we all belong!

CHAPTER VII

THE RECOVERY OF THE DILEMMA

It is the insistent declaration of this discussion that man, in order to live fully as man, must confront and accept the dilemma of the two worlds upon the horns of which he is caught. The reason or reasons why man is thus situated have no bearing upon the matter. No man knows why. Perhaps no man will ever know why. It is probable that the conditions of human experience demand not only that the dilemma be acknowledged but also that its *raison d'être* be hidden. There are some problems which man's understanding can never unravel; for once man's understanding has unravelled them, man ceases to possess the understanding of man and finds himself in possession of an understanding which is superhuman. We are dealing with man as man—not with man as angel or with man as quasi-deity.

In order that religion may be recovered and that the subjective world may be restored to a place of reality in the consciousness of contem-

porary men, it is first necessary that the critical dilemma be recovered and restored. This is the *sine qua non* of religious or spiritual actuality in a time when the objective world has been pushed so far to the fore by science that the inner realm has grown shadowy and vague. To put the case in other words, it has become imperative that science and its world be shoved back to its proper field and that the two worlds of religion and of science be brought face to face across the boundary that restricts them both.

When this has been done we discover that science and religion are sovereign each in its own realm, and that incursions by one or the other upon forbidden territory are an open breach of the covenant by which man's dual life is and must be regulated.

Science must be accepted as the proper and only gauge of objective reality. This is the first article of the covenant. To science one must go in order to find out anything about the outer world! So far as science is concerned, the outer world is the only world that exists.

Science is dependent for its data upon the sensory system of the physical organism; and its dependence is largely upon the phenomena recorded through the eye. It is in a universe of visible occurrences that science is most familiarly at home.

The prime task of science is to correlate the visual experiences of man into an orderly scheme of thought and to apply this coördination of experience to man's practical life. To segregate, to analyze, to rearrange, to synthesize and to employ the facts discovered in every phase of research, is the tremendous business of scientific genius.

It is not to be wondered at that scientists are sometimes carried away with the enthusiasm of their research to such lengths as to make them forgetful of their function. Being men, and therefore carrying on at least a vestigial subjective life, they are quite naturally led to treat their facts subjectively and with an almost religious veneration. They are, in other words, inclined sometimes to try their hand at being philosophers and metaphysicians. An astronomer may become so stirred over the amazing revelations of his instrument as to be persuaded that he has found God in the skies; whereas in the skies no sign of God can possibly be discovered except as one reads into those skies the things that he has originally discovered in his soul. Some scientists are disposed to interpret all physical phenomena spiritually, which is merely a disposition to let their mystical endowments loose upon objective nature. At the moment when they do this they cease to be scientific and become poetic. No one denies that to be poetic is excellent;

but a poet deals with a different set of experiences from those that confront a scientist. Let scientists adhere to science. Or, failing that, let them treat objectivity objectively and refrain from interpolating empirical summaries with mystical guesses.

Science can know nothing of God, even as religion can know nothing of nature. If God and nature are ever to be brought into a synthesis, they will be brought to such a synthesis by an influence neither scientific nor religious—an influence or force which can work with equal facility in either realm. This force exists and may be called the *critical and creative reason.* We shall introduce it into our discussion in a succeeding chapter.

Meanwhile, we are dealing with reality as it is revealed to man's consciousness through science and religion. And we are laying it down as fundamental that science as science must refrain from all excursions into the metaphysical field. Science knows what the senses plus instruments reveal. Science knows nothing more than that! An astronomer or an anthropologist is no more properly equipped by his research and findings to comment intelligently upon spiritual matters than is a mystic (for example a man like Phillips Brooks) equipped by his subjective research to comment intelligently upon astrophysical laws or the palæolithic appearances of man!

It is no less clear, on the other hand, that religion must refrain from extending its conclusions into the range where science is at home.

Objective nature, to the religious consciousness, is symbolic of subjective states. A mystic or a poet must regard nature with "an inward eye." To him a river, a mountain, a tree, a flower, are as the embodiment of spiritual truths. Speaking or writing of natural objects, he will employ such phrases as,

"Dear hills that know me,"
"The morning stars sang together,"
"The mountains danced as rams,"
"He [the sun] rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course,"
"Let music swell the breeze and ring from all the trees,"
"Sermons in stones and books in running brooks."

Poetic imagery and religious symbolism illustrate the manner in which subjective experience likes to objectify itself. The whole natural world is pressed into service by the soul to minister to its needs. Sacraments are the extensions into space-time of eternal and infinite concepts. The eucharist is a celebration of the entrance into objective material of immaterial spirit. Marriage between a man and a woman is interpreted as symbolic of the rela-

tionship that exists between Christ and his Church. The same tendency runs through every phase of man's inward life. Outer events are regarded as being in truth the partial projection of inward reality.

Just because the objective world is more obviously real and therefore more easily grasped by man, subjective experience is almost driven to clothe itself in the forms of sensory experience. The soul seeks to externalize itself in one way or another. The inner life wants an outer body. As Paul wrote (speaking of life after death), "not that we would be unclothed, but that we might be clothed upon." In other words, Paul desired his immortality in some sort of bodily shape. He spoke, in this respect, for the innate yearning of all mankind.

There can be no serious quarrel with this yearning, however paradoxical it may appear to be. Considering the history of man and his origin (as man) in the matrix of an exclusively physical environment, it is entirely to be expected that his spiritual nature should turn outward as a child to its mother. He has been more used to nature than to God! His habits are more grooved in the body than in the soul. His spirit, like an immigrant to some new continent, still persists in carrying on the customs and folk-ways of the motherland.

And in so doing he does not encroach upon the privileges granted either by his new home or by his old. He is simply trying to adapt himself to a strange environment.

Just so, man's poetical, his mystical, his artistic expression in outward form, represent his endeavour to realize his inward life in terms which he himself can understand. Without some extension in the space-time world, man (unless he became completely a mystic) could scarcely maintain his spiritual being. So embedded is his consciousness in the objectively real.

There lies no difficulty in this imaginative overreaching or outreaching of religion into the territory of science, so long as religion acknowledges the purely imaginary or symbolical character of its objectification. But when religion sets up its picture of nature in opposition to that of science, then ensues the gravest of difficulty.

Religion, for example, is interested in the background of man's spiritual development. Where does the soul come from? What is its nature? Who creates it? Why *is* it created? Religion has the answer to these questions. Religion, in one set of terms or another, replies, "The soul comes from God. Its nature is spiritual and it is closely related to God's life. God is responsible for it. God alone knows why it is created." In order to make clearer

these answers, religion tells a story about an imaginary occurrence in the outer world. In the setting of a beautiful garden man and woman are brought to life. Because of their disobedience, they are ultimately driven out.

This story is a legend or myth. Its significance is subjective or spiritual. Its interpretation is legitimately allegorical. It illustrates an endeavour to picture forth objectively a strictly spiritual fact.

But in the course of time religion begins to claim that this allegory is not allegory but literal fact. Religion insists that the myth is indeed a statement of actual history in the field of biochemical anthropology. Whereupon religion lays itself open to the charge of interfering with the advancement of knowledge. And of this misdemeanour religion is guilty. Just as guilty as science is when science steps across its boundary into the realm of religion.

Science can tell us authoritatively that the creation account in Genesis is objectively unhistorical. Religion can state with equal authority that the account is subjectively according to the truth. Science is criminal when it attacks the spiritual veracity of the narrative. Religion is outlaw when it defends the objective historicity of the story.

In like manner, religion is interested in the personality of Jesus, for the reason that in this personality are met together practically all of the

values which to man's soul existence are important. Whether Jesus ever lived in the objective world is, to religion, a matter of indifference. Religion, properly understood, is concerned only with the values, not with the embodiment.

Science, also, is interested in Jesus, for the reason that he has exerted an enormous influence upon the objective history of mankind. The fact that Jesus represents the integration of a series of subjective values is alien to the interest of scientific research. Science is involved only in the effort to discover what, if any, historically valid evidence exists for the tradition of Jesus.

It is plain, is it not, that religion and science, correctly limited each to its own sphere, can have no possible conflict or misunderstanding about the nature and position of Jesus? If Jesus does not sum up in himself the great spiritual qualities, religion has no further stake in him. Or if Jesus never lived biologically in space-time then science will pass him by.

But as a matter of record the Christian religion has, for the most part, been particularly anxious to prove and preserve the belief in the literal, physico-biological, historical existence of Jesus, including all of the miracles connected by tradition with his birth, ministry, and resurrection; while science has kept its finger, interminably long and unbelievably

clumsy, at the uninterrupted task of poking into religion's affair with the transcendent Christ!

Religion should have naught to do with the so-called "historical Jesus," because he is none of religion's business. Science should have naught to do with the "living Christ," because he is none of science's affair.

The same statement goes for the whole range of subjective and objective experience.

Science must be accepted and trusted as the proper gauge of all objective reality.

Religion must be accepted and trusted as the proper gauge of all subjective reality.

Religion and science must remain each in its own proper field.

Two mutually exclusive definitions of life may be cited here to point the argument. One is from the Gospel of John and the other from a scientific work by the late Professor Jaques Loeb entitled *The Organism as a Whole.*

The religious definition (John 1:4) is as follows: "In him [Jesus] was life; and the life was the light of men."

The scientific definition is given thus: "Life is a series of chemical reactions, connected in a catenary way."

It is evident that these definitions are offered each from a particular standpoint. The one is sub-

jectively mystical, the other objectively mechanistic. Yet both are entirely correct. The life in Jesus Christ has been the light of countless men. Who dare deny it? On the other hand, life as it is viewed mechanically is undoubtedly a series of chemical reactions connected by a process which runs through time.

But once let religion declare Professor Loeb's definition to be wrong, or let science ridicule the definition of the Gospel, and we find ourselves in a topsy-turvy world where the mystic is explaining to the scientist what he must believe; and where the scientist is imposing upon the mystic an arbitrary dictatorship of conviction. From this results confusion, misunderstanding, and ultimately the degeneration both of religion and science in equal measure!

Religion lives in the world where the life of Jesus Christ is the light of men.

Science dwells where chemical reactions are connected in such a catenary way as to produce biological existence.

And man must live in both worlds—a sharer of the Christly light and a chemically reacting organism. This is his tragic necessity. This is his doom. This is also his glorious destiny!

Efforts to ignore the conflicting elements in man's experience move in one of three directions.

They lead either to subjective overemphasis and the extreme phases of mysticism; or to objective overemphasis and the so-called "prosperity complex" of contemporary civilization; or to sentimental descriptions of a "universe" through which Pippa passes gaily singing:

> "God's in his heaven—
> All's right with the world."

Recognition and acceptance of the inescapable conflict, on the other hand, issue in an heroic manliness characterized by inward distinction, outward patience, and altogether a certain ironical saltiness of disposition which seasons both inner and outer experience with realistic flavour.

The individual who has taken his life on the terms laid down and has lived it so can invariably be pointed out as one marked at once by his depth of spiritual penetration and by his readiness to use whatever material or circumstances are at hand in his outer environment. He is both a seer and an opportunist. He dreams great dreams and trusts his soul to them. But in the world of time and space he expects not too much and, since he has no illusions, is never caught in the meshes of despair. Abraham Lincoln is perhaps the most striking example in recent history of such an individual. No other has plumbed more profoundly the deeps

of cosmic destiny, and no other has brought to affairs a more ironically detached disillusionment. He could write the Second Inaugural and compose the Gettysburg Address. He could also spin whimsical yarns or, in a national crisis, chuckle aloud over Artemus Ward's rather bald humour. Or he could manipulate a political machine with the cool shrewdness of a "ward heeler."

It is not by accident that Abraham Lincoln has become a hero, not alone of his own land, but in every part of the world. Men respond to a man who has confronted the full possibility of life, all of its joy and all of its tragedy, and who has met its whole impact with unflinching steadiness.

In other words, mankind worships as heroes those who recognize and accept the critical dilemma and who live in both worlds without fear and without ever drawing back from either.

The poet Shelley has described the type in his "Prometheus Unbound," as follows:

"To suffer woes which Hope thinks infinite;
To endure wrongs darker than death or night,
To defy Power which seems omnipotent,
To love and bear; to hope till Hope creates
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates;
Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent;
This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free;
This is alone Life, Joy, Empire and Liberty."

What is this but the picture of man when he has recovered his dilemma and has determined to live in both worlds at no matter what cost! Here is the subjectively developed man, and here is the man who is objectively evolved. He is spiritual, he is scientific. He denies neither the perfection of his dream nor the battering imperfection of his outer existence. Both are to him equally real. Body is not more than soul and soul is no more than body. Soul goes in one direction and body proceeds in another. They belong, soul and body, to different phases of the universal reality. So far as he can see, until his critical reason tackles the problem, the two phases are entirely distinct and lie in definitely separate ranges of experience.

And here he is, pathetic and yet heroic man, striving to free himself from his dilemma. He denies the outer world and becomes a mystic only to find himself crippled and at last only half a man! He denies the inner world and becomes a materialist, only to find himself deformed beyond recognition, to the appearance of a well-fed and finely groomed animal. He tries to merge the two worlds and becomes a sentimentalist, only to find himself being dissolved to a jellylike consistency, a flabby and timorous caricature of his true appearance. Then, at length, he returns to reality, recovers his dilemma, and reconstitutes himself

a full-orbed man! He rediscovers himself as a being projected upon a stage where at the same time a cosmic and a biochemical drama are being enacted; and finds himself making an effort to play his part in both. He cannot help himself. He must do it. And therefore, clumsily, absurdly, pitifully, yet magnificently too, he plays his paradoxical part. He plays his part and leaves the stage. Others come to take his place. The plays go on. The ambiguous plays go on!

Each of the plays has a name: the one is called Religion and the other is called Science. And they both go on!

They are going on to-day, while in bland plagiarism, modern man, cribbing the lighter lines from each, makes up a new little playlet which he calls "Prosperity."

CHAPTER VIII

INTERPRETATION OF OBJECTIVE REALITY

THE preceding chapter ended with a picture of man in the rôle of an actor, attempting to play a single part in two dramas, the one cosmic and the other biochemical. In language stripped of metaphor, this is a description of man's paradoxical position within two worlds. The two coincide in his experience, not juxtaposed but merged. The subjective and the objective mingle themselves throughout the entire course of life.

It is only through the use of the critical faculty known as reason that man is ever able to separate the dual phases of existence one from the other. Without his reason he would find himself pushed and pulled, hauled and dragged, back and forth, in and out, up and down, by his body and by his soul, in a turmoil of inconsequential fluxes. Unconscious of the duality of experience, he would attribute his distress to some confusion in the very structure of this world; and would, as many actually do, arrive at the desperate conviction that life,

in the very nature of things, must be entirely chaotic, wholly anarchic.

The primary task of the reason is, accordingly, seen to lie in the field of analysis; and its chief function at the start is that of defining the terms of the dual existence that man is called upon to carry through. The reason must prove to man that, constituted as he is, the world of experience must be divided sharply into the objective and the subjective. Thus and thus only may he learn the technique of rational living. Thus and thus only may he learn to discriminate between the ideals that arise in his soul and the practical limitations of outer necessity. And only thus may he school himself to withstand on the one hand a tendency to expect too much from nature and on the other to require too little of God.

The critical reason it is that determines the bounds that govern spiritual exploration and scientific research. It is a clarifying agent, and serves to make plain by analysis the qualities which may properly be ascribed to objective and to subjective reality in due order. It segregates the two types of experience and consigns each to its own category. It makes possible for man a life divided into definite and explicit functions, and thus saves him from futility and despair. Although it faces mankind with the tragic conflict between the two

realms, it does not, at any rate, lull him into a sense of false security. Although it reminds man of his dilemma, it also shows him how to see his dilemma through; and ultimately it leads the way to deliverance even from this stress.

In its analytical capacity the critical reason sets about to interpret reality in each phase as it appears to human consciousness. We may, therefore, from this standpoint, describe objective reality as a continuum in space-time, reported by the five senses and interpreted by the reason. We may, likewise, describe subjective reality as a continuum outside space-time reported by intuition and interpreted by the reason.

We shall, in this chapter, devote ourselves to a consideration of objective reality as described above.

The narrow limits which restrict the senses in their reception of stimuli from the outer world are often ignored by those, especially, who seek to develop a complete theory of existence from the report given by the sensory system. As Spengler points out, man lives, objectively, in a world that is mostly visual—a light world. His picture of outer reality is painted largely by the eye, and upon this organ he is dependent for the major part of his knowledge of nature. What the ear reports is quite secondary in importance; and the testi-

mony of his other senses is scarcely noticed save under conditions of emergency as when, for example, a noxious odour or a burning heat or an unpalatable taste repel him. Now it is quite conceivable that a race of men, endowed much as our own race is endowed, should have so developed, and come to depend upon the ear for information and direction, as to render the eye of secondary value. In which case the objective world would be primarily an *audible* world, conceived as one of sound, tone, noise, silence, music, or discordance. The striking revolution in human judgment as to the nature of things which such a shift in sensory emphasis would precipitate can be only vaguely imagined. No blind person reared in our actual environment could quite imagine it; for even those born blind are trained to visualize inwardly by visually minded parents and teachers, so that they do not escape the influence of our emphasis.

It would seem that an audible world must possess different characteristics from a visual one. It would be measured by the quality of sound rather than by the quality of appearance. But how should spatial dimensions be *heard?* The eye would report certain appearances; but under the dominance of the ear its report would be interpreted audibly. An object "here" would be said, perhaps, to sound pleasantly; an object "there" would sound harshly.

So, instead of saying, "It is here. It is there," we should say, "It is pleasant sound. It is harsh sound."

Audible characteristics would be accorded a position of superior importance over visible characteristics. The criterion of judgment would be altered. Thus, language would change. Figures of speech, by us as a rule visually grounded, would be derived from the experience of hearing. Instead of "it seems to me" we should remark "it sounds to me." Intelligence would be likened to harmony and ignorance to discord. God would, perhaps, be called "The Music of the world." In short, whereas we employ auditory metaphors upon occasion but less often than visual, a race of men whose ears had supplanted their eyes would rely mainly upon metaphors taken from the world which they had heard. In describing a friend, a member of such a race would linger over his voice and its quality, referring rather casually to his appearance.

One could entertain a great deal of interesting, but perhaps not vitally relevant, speculation upon the alteration in the apparent (or shall we say *audible?*) constitution of objective reality which the overturn of sensory emphasis would create. The sole purpose of such guesswork or deduction in this discussion, however, is to point out the ex-

ceedingly limited and obviously segmentary view (or shall we say *audition?*) of the universe which our senses bring to us. Dependent as we are upon these sensories, and grateful as we should be for their services, it is sheer folly to regard their testimony as in any sense conclusive. They open up small cracks, or carry small sounds, of reality to our waking consciousness. Who knows what escapes them! Beetles, perhaps, or earthworms, or humming-birds, or bees possess means of information which man is utterly without. It is possible that wild animals receive knowledge of the outer world in ways beyond human comprehension. Primitive men seem (or shall we say, *sound?*) to be able to see, hear, feel, taste, smell, or by some method find out about phenomena which civilized man never discovers.

What does this mean? Simply that our cultivated sensory system shows (or tells) us what must be an infinitesimal fraction of the truth about the world of nature.

And yet, despite this most palpable of all verities, there are those who are so lacking in sound analytical capacity as to aspire toward an authentic and a complete world view upon the lame wings of sensory experience, augmented somewhat by scientific instruments of research! The situation is as if men tried in an airplane to soar to Mars!

It cannot be done! The sensory apparatus is too meagre to be relied upon exclusively for use in the description of total reality. Man may and must be content through his senses to gain a scanty fund of information; barely enough, indeed, to permit him to support his existence in the outer world! And it is this scanty fund of information which the senses receive and send to the seat of consciousness, and which the reason interprets as objective reality. Surely, a small task for the reason in comparison with what would be imposed were man endowed with five hundred senses instead of five!

Now what the reason first lays down about objective reality is that there is a continuity in its extension in space and its flow through time. In other words, the outer world of sensory experience is to the reason an unbroken whole, each segment connected with every other segment, and each moment of its duration fastened, so to speak, to every other moment both past and future. This is a discovery the importance and significance of which cannot be overestimated.

Its importance lies in the fact that the outer world is found to be a universe, obedient to a single system of laws, coördinated in a single system of time events.

Its significance lies in the fact that all sensory testimony agrees upon the fundamental character of the universe. Sight, hearing, taste, touch, smell, are in one accord as to this. Each testifies in its own way to the same reality.

Let us suppose that this were not the case; and that objective reality, according to the reason's interpretation, were chaotic on the one hand and disconnected in its communication with the human sense organs on the other. There is only one conceivable outcome to such a supposititious condition. Life, as we know it, would be impossible. Every phase of existence would be nullified by every other phase. Should this anarchic discontinuous state of things suddenly come to pass in our now orderly and integrated world, the very physical organism which we own would go to pieces. Chemical reactions would fail to react. Physical properties would cease to exist as such. Electromagnetic forces would fluctuate or else disappear entirely. Material bodies would behave erratically until they had disintegrated—that is, if the word "until" can be employed in relation to a condition wherein time itself had gone mad.

But the picture is too fantastic. No stretch or distortion of the imagination could enable us to conceive a situation such as this. We live, move,

and have our being in a world of objective reality which is continuous, orderly, dependable. Our minds cannot think of any other.

This, then, is the world which our sensory system presents to consciousness and which our critical reason interprets.

It lies extended through what is called "three-dimensional space," stretching away in all directions from every observer. How far it may stretch passes our visual understanding excepting as we invent instruments which can extend our sight to farther and farther limits. Even so, we are not able to reach its utmost boundaries; but our reason generalizes from the reports that are brought in and constructs a theory as to spatial extension which is held tentatively until further testimony can be gathered which either fortifies or destroys it. Several theories, perhaps, will be suggested, as in the case of Einstein's cylindrical universe and the spherical universe of de Sitter.

This world moves, moreover, in a "stream" of time which seems to flow in one direction from what is called "the past" into what is called "the future." The reason, tackling the sensory reports about time, is greatly baffled by their rather vague character. Time is a more difficult phenomenon for the reason to interpret than space. But there it is! And the reason must get at it!

Every event that is reported by the senses and their instrumental aids occurs at some particular point in three-dimensional space and at some particular instant in time. So the reason has decided to speak of point events in the universe as being the space-time locations of all occurrences. What is more, the reason has decided to take certain typical point events out of their setting in space-time and to study them in isolation. Only so can reason handle them. Thus a ray of light is segregated and its structure studied; or an atom of hydrogen is abstracted from its environment and broken up into its electronic parts. Such arbitrary treatment of the world is justified by the reason only because of necessity. The reason admits that the treatment is arbitrary and that it does actual violence to the objective reality which the senses report. It is obvious, of course, that points in space and instants in time have no reality in the outer world; for space and time are continuous and unbroken by points and instants. The reason simply takes the liberty of an interpreter, who must always break in upon continuity and hold it up until the interpretation has been made.

The reason can conceive an objective world containing many more than three dimensions of space; one, indeed, in which time is reduced to a spatial dimension. By means of mathematics the

reason works out an idea of such a world; but the five senses refuse to authorize the reason so to interpret their testimony. They insist upon being taken seriously—at least, so it appears (or sounds) ; although the reason reserves the right to question whether it receives the sensory testimony uncensored by what it calls the "habitual or instinctive" interpretations of the "lower" consciousness. There is much to be said for the view, taken by the critical reason, that hereditary racial characteristics show themselves in the way in which this "lower" consciousness revises the direct report of the sensory system before submitting it to the "higher" consciousness.

At all events, the senses are so closely allied in their technique with the instinctive functions of human life that the critical reason, for all practical purposes, must put up with and accept the possibly garbled report and hope only gradually to penetrate through the censorship to the actual sensory experience.

Meanwhile, it remains true that the objective world is brought to the reason as a continuum in space-time, and that the reason must interpret this continuum as best it can. And while the reason is busied with its task, man must go on living in this continuum, adapting his life to its necessities until he is able, by the further use of reason, to

rearrange the outer world somewhat to suit his convenience, his ambition, or his whim.

In this outer world he finds himself to be both at home and abroad. His body is at home in it, but his soul is a stranger there. His body *is* the outer world, or a section of it. His body is chemical in its action, physical in its properties, spatial in extension, temporal in duration. It can be measured by line and weight. Its progress is marked by a succession of point events. It occupies a certain space at a certain time. It moves in three-dimensional continua at certain speeds. Yes, man's body is of the objective world, and to the objective world it belongs alone!

The reason, therefore, in dealing with the body of man, must deal with it as it deals with all space-time continua. The reason takes the testimony of the senses and interprets it. From the senses it learns of glands, blood stream, vascular system, and a complex series of chemical reactions. Out of this evidence it creates a coherent body of information as to the physical nature of man's existence. A science is born—the science of biochemistry.

From the senses, also, the reason learns of man's previous appearances upon earth; learns that man has dwelt upon this planet for a very long time, much longer than his recorded history would

indicate. It learns, too, about the various stages of man's development; the senses bring to it the testimony gathered from rocks and clay pits or river beds, with a few bones and bits of jaw or skull. Whereupon, the reason constructs a theory of man's history from remote periods—and calls the science which has to do with this phase of sensory discovery by the name "anthropology."

Gradually, the reason being actively engaged upon the accumulating evidence brought in by the senses, there emerges from mental chaos a semi-orderly structure of thought and interpretation, which is known as magic, and then, after a series of struggles against intellectual inertia, is dignified by the great name "science." After which, through the most painstaking effort, the sensory reports are coördinated so thoroughly that the objective world becomes familiar territory to the reason which travels over it with easy self-assurance. Its forces and counterforces are brought under control. Huge mechanisms are invented and built for the transformation of the outer world into the servant of man's reason. The subjugation of nature goes on. Its mysteries grow less awesome, its potentialities less destructive. Its ultimate character, as the senses report it, seems less difficult to comprehend. Newton explains its technique. Einstein adds to Newton's explanation. And the

critical reason enters upon an era of triumphant conquest over the realm where man's body is at home and which man's senses have spied upon to gather the secret witness which needed only to be decoded to be understood.

This, then, is the achievement of man's critical reason in its analytical capacity. First, it drew the necessary line between objective and subjective reality. Then it applied itself to the analysis and interpretation of the objective world as the senses brought in their report of it. Then it helped the senses in their work by supplying them, the eye especially, with auxiliary instruments. Then it undertook the tremendous task of correlating all sensory experiences into one great volume of experience; and, having done so, of interpreting this experience in an orderly system of thought called science. And finally, this accomplished, the reason took its science and put it to work for man's body so effectively that to-day man is becoming with increasing acceleration the master of the outer world of which once he was the slave.

The brilliance of this achievement by the critical reason is so dazzling that it seems likely, unless a great awakening takes place, to blind man to the fact that there is another field of effort which calls for the reason's services. This is, of course, the subjective field.

Separated by the reason from the objective, the inner realm awaits the thorough analysis and rational interpretation which have been applied to the outer world. Science has here its counterpart —a counterpart to which science is inevitably hostile and of which it is jealous; but nevertheless its exact equivalent in the subjective realm. This counterpart is religion.

For there exists for man a real world where his body is abroad but where his soul is at home. Of this world he is made aware by what he calls "intuition" or "spiritual insight." And to the report and testimony of this "awareness" it is the task of man's critical reason to apply itself even as it undertook to apply itself to the testimony of the senses.

In the succeeding chapter we shall consider the subjective reality as a continuum outside space-time, reported by intuition and interpreted by the reason.

CHAPTER IX

INTERPRETATION OF SUBJECTIVE REALITY

As we embark upon the difficult seas of subjective analysis a certain caution or wariness should govern our going. Especially is this true with regard to the terms which we employ in attempting to describe the work of the critical reason in relationship to spiritual reality. For unless we are careful we shall find ourselves using the nomenclature of science, which is entirely unfit for use in this phase of our consideration. And, what is more, we shall all too readily fall into the error of applying or seeking to apply scientific technique to the treatment of spiritual experience; an error which has vitiated a great deal of contemporary thought along religious lines.

It is no more excusable to speak of inward reality in scientific terms than to treat of outward reality in religious terms. Physics and chemistry, biology and astronomy, geometry and mathematics have their own vocabularies. So also has religion. Let us, therefore, steer clear of the reefs

and shoals upon which many a promising modern metaphysician has foundered. Let us eschew (as would a good Puritan of an older time have eschewed the devil and all his works) the so-called "psychological" approach to subjective reality; the approach that catalogues and files the "varieties of religious experience" and describes them much as one would describe the organic functioning of the small intestine! This is the method of approach *from the outside in;* whereas the only valid method is that *from the inside out.*

Whether or not psychology has earned as yet the right to a truly scientific status, its technique is and must be essentially scientific. A "psychology of religion" would be, therefore, a *science* of religion —a bald contradiction in terms. There can no more be a "science of religion" than there can be a "religion of science"! What if there are those whose employment of words is so loose as to permit every sort of misunderstanding! Let us endeavour, at the very least, to select terms which do not cancel each other in the same sentence.

Religion and science are mutually exclusive terms, since the phases of reality which they represent are mutually exclusive. Science is the authoritative spokesman for sensory experience in the objective world of space-time. Religion is the equally

authoritative spokesman for spiritual experience in the subjective world outside space-time. It should be clear, therefore, that the speech of the one spokesman cannot be imitated by the other without robbing language of its very meaning. It should be clear, but obviously it is not; because contemporary literature is turgid with the lucubrations of psychologists (Freudian, Behaviouristic, or what not), of sociologists, of geologists, chemists, physicists, anthropologists, and biologists, who essay to describe for mankind the "true nature" of the soul's ineffable communion with God. The confusion which they create by their dry and jejune contribution to the store of misapprehension is equalled only by the naïveté with which they assume the mantle of the prophets or the jauntiness with which they wrap themselves around in this to them inappropriate drapery.

The whole bulky volume of contemporary so-called "scientific analysis of religion" is not, from the standpoint of true spiritual value, worth the first verse of the Twenty-third Psalm; nor has the scientist's invitation to follow his lead the minutest fraction of the cogency of Jesus' appeal,

"Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden
And I will give you rest."

"Science in search of God" may wander in the wilderness for ten times forty years before it comes upon the miraculous discovery that,

"Underneath are the everlasting arms."

Let us, however, turn aside from this somewhat forensic manner and give ourselves to the task in hand; namely, the development of an interpretation of the subjective world as a continuum outside space-time, reported by the intuition.

How may we be certain that there exists a continuum outside space-time?

How can we, indeed, be certain that there exists a continuum within space-time?

The answer in both cases must be the same. We must accept the testimony of those organs or instruments which claim to bring authentic evidence to the consciousness. This is an act of practical faith, without which we may be sure of nothing! Unless we give some credence to eyes and ears we shall be unable to maintain a rational existence in the objective world!

In like manner, unless we give some credence to the intuition we shall be unable to live in the subjective world.

It is possible and entirely justifiable to maintain an attitude of experimental skepticism toward

all evidence, whether that of the sensory system or that of spiritual intuition; and to assert our belief that the real world is ultimately neither what the senses tell us nor what the intuition reveals. In so doing we should undoubtedly be right. The *real world* in its entire reality is unquestionably far beyond our understanding or discovery. But we need not, therefore, abandon ourselves to dismay and discouragement, nor cease from effort to understand those appearances or intimations of total reality which come to us through our human instrumentalities. The senses certainly tell us something! Dare we claim less for the intuition? To do so would be to commit spiritual suicide!

We therefore, in this discussion, claim for spiritual intuition exactly the same status as that accorded by common consent in the objective realm to the physical senses. Our enterprise may thus move forward to its task, unhindered by further doubt.

We establish for subjective experience a certain hypothesis—and upon that we build the structure of our spiritual analysis. Once more we state the hypothesis: By intuition we discover the real existence of a continuum which is neither spatial nor temporal. This continuum is what we call the subjective world. Religion is the technique we employ in gathering a body of experience by intuition,

which the critical reason must endeavour to interpret.

In a world of spatial extension and temporal duration all reality possesses attributes of shape and size; and all reality is in flux along the direction of a certain time. This spatial extension may conceivably be of any number of dimensions, and in it there may be any number of times, each flowing in its own direction. But every phenomenon must be conditioned by space and time—that is, it must occur *somewhere at some time.*

In a world beyond or outside space-time (a nonspatial and nontemporal world) no reality possesses the attribute of shape or size; and there is no flux or movement in any direction. In such a world "events" never happen! "Events" are! They never occur! They exist forever! In such a world there can be neither here nor there, now nor then, far nor near, past nor future. This is perfectly logical and is easily grasped in the abstract even by the objective mind.

Is this the world revealed by intuition? Does spiritual experience tell us of any such condition? The scientific analysis scouts the possibility of such a thing. What says the mystic?

The unanimous testimony of all mysticism speaks of such a world. Whatever disagreements lie between the various reports of those whose sub-

jective experience has been vivid and impressive, there is no disagreement on this point. The world of spiritual experience is neither temporal nor spatial. It is eternal and it is infinite. It has no beginning, no ending, nor any boundary whatever. Neither has it movement either from time to time or from place to place. No size can be found in it, no weight, no mass or volume. It has neither velocity nor acceleration. Within it are no relative amounts nor relative durations. It contains no quantity, more or less. It possesses no age, greater or lesser. Its single attribute is that of *quality*. All of the relations in the subjective world are qualitative relations.

This is to say that in the spiritual realm the prime qualities of Goodness, Truth, Beauty, and Love are discovered by intuition to reside in relative status to each other and ultimately to God, who is the qualitative Absolute.

The difficulty, however, which is encountered by religion in its effort to express itself in language can scarcely be overestimated. As we have already noted, the soul is constantly drawn to some form of self-objectification; for the reason that the outer world is more familiar to waking consciousness than the inner. Spiritual experience seeks to project itself outward into space-time; and in so doing selects certain phases of outward experience for

its use as symbols. The result is that the spiritual continuum is presented to consciousness in temporal and spatial dimensions which greatly limit and hamper its expression. Language, which is the outgrowth of sensory experience, is one of the vehicles which the subjective intuition employs as an articulation of its testimony. But language cannot be an adequate vehicle for spiritual self-revelation unless it is used and received figuratively. Therefore, in writing of the inner world we must remember, and in reading of it we must not forget, that when the language seems to borrow from sensory experience it does so only metaphorically. Thus, for example, the word "event" in a subjective employment means *that which corresponds to an event*. Literally, an event cannot be conceived to happen except in space-time. Figuratively, the apprehension of a quality in the spiritual field is like the recording of an event in the field of outer experience. That is, when the soul "senses" (to use an objective figure) the quality of Goodness, the experience is an "event." Language has no other means of stating the situation than by such analogous figures. For this reason, the subtler and more profound spiritual experiences can never be described or even suggested to the consciousness except by direct report from intuition. Browning puts it thus:

"Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke thro' language and escaped:
All I could never be,
All men ignored in me,
This I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher
shaped."

Between God and man there are hidden things that may never be revealed to another save by intuition.

It is for this reason that poetry and the other fine arts comprise the most satisfactory means of spiritual objectification. They are frankly symbolical and do not ever pretend to literalness of meaning. To be appreciated, art must be felt, that is, apprehended intuitively. The "practical" or objective mind invariably misses the artistic significance; not through a lack of intelligence, but rather through deficiency of spiritual awareness. Art is man's most consummate achievement in making objective fact serve to tell a subjective truth.

Every outer fact may, however, be made to serve a symbolic or sacramental purpose. And man's everyday life at its best is in reality but a projection of his soul upon the screen of a space-time world. Man's practical existence, when lifted to its highest possibility, is the expression of a

religious urgency. His work, his play, his loves, his science, his art, his social relationships, may be to him the embodiment of great spiritual ideals. When this is so, man's outer life is the fulfilment of a tragic destiny; for, having envisaged Perfection within his soul, he yearns to create it in his body—but can never achieve this. The outer world inevitably crucifies his dream and drives him back to the only realm where the soul may hope for its consummation.

This is, of course, the dilemma with the consideration of which we began our discussion at the outset. The two hostile worlds are brought together in man, and he is the victim of their strife. Only his critical and creative reason can analyze the situation and eventually provide him with the technique for constructive living in both realms.

Here, perhaps, is an appropriate point whereat to clear up a possible misapprehension. We have stated repeatedly that science and religion deal with two different categories of experience and must, therefore, remain each within its own sphere. We have, however, just suggested that science may prove itself to be an outgrowth of man's religious necessity. The two statements may appear to be (as they are) paradoxical.

The explanation of the paradox is this: When a religious urgency causes man to objectify his

spiritual experience in scientific research it forces him to take up a task in the strictly sensory field. Having done so, religion must be content to act as the *impulse* or *dynamic* of scientific exploration and must never aspire to a control over the method or conclusions of research. The scientist, as a man of spiritual experience, may desire to express his spirituality as a biologist. But when he has undertaken his biological experiments he must behave himself as a biologist and not as a mystic. If he permits his mysticism to influence his biology he injures his spirituality and discounts the objective accuracy of his work. A biologist *as a biologist* has no prerogative to render decisions about subjective realities. If he is a great biologist, and more than a parrot of other men's views, he is undoubtedly by prior right a man of great inner resourcefulness, and will be too wise and too penetrating to permit biological phenomena to influence his intuitions of the Absolute; as he will be too intelligent to allow his intuitions of the Absolute to influence his view of objective life-phenomena. His religion will be an incentive to science but never a censor. His science will be an outward expression of his religion, but never a critic.

The same thing applies to all activity in the outer range. At his best, man always is taking his soul into the space-time world. But, at his best,

he is never willing to agree that achievement in the space-time world endows him automatically with the ability to speak or even to think authoritatively of the spiritual world. The fact that he is a famous scientist or a successful industrialist or business man, or a noted preacher, is no criterion by which to gauge his greatness in the subjective realm. It is quite likely that a child or a very humble person may be the greater in the kingdom of heaven!

It is, therefore, sheer folly to do as is so often done to-day: to interview scientists and successful men of affairs to find out their views upon religious matters. They may indeed be qualified to speak, or they may not be qualified. But the implication that because a man is outwardly effective or resourceful he is by that token inwardly significant is one which should be resented by every person who is trying to help mankind to a recovery of religion. No man is equipped to speak of religion who is not passionately religious, and when he speaks of spiritual matters he must do so in religious terms. Whoever undertakes to describe or in any way to represent religion to men must either have experienced religion profoundly in his soul or else he places himself in the position of an impostor! How long, then, must we submit to being harangued, lectured,

and advised about religion by sociologists, historians, anthropologists, and psychologists?

It is the critical reason that raises these questions. The reason is neither for nor against science, and neither for nor against religion. The reason simply finds itself confronted with the task of first separating and then interpreting two worlds of experience. It accepts them both as being equally real, but different in their impact upon man's consciousness. The one strikes upon man's physical sensory system. The other touches man's spiritual intuitive faculty. They come into contact when the spiritual faculty seeks to express itself objectively; in other words, when man tries to live in both worlds at the same time.

Both worlds are mysterious, but the inner world is the more so. It baffles man's mind even more than does the world of outer nature. Yet it offers man's soul the greater solace, the deeper satisfaction.

For in the spiritual realm man finds himself intuitively in the presence of the Absolute whom he calls God. Perfection is there, beyond all struggle, beyond all limitations. The Ideal is there, undistorted and complete in every way. Goodness is there, and Beauty, and Truth, and Love. And there man knows himself to be more than he realized himself to be as he stood looking up at the

sky in the outer world. The sky seemed far away, and the vast distances of space overawed him. The gigantic forces of nature, now friendly and now his enemies, disturbed him. He felt small and weak out there. He felt terribly alone, even in the midst of his fellow men. Sometimes he was afraid. And always he knew that in time he must perish. But here, in the secret place of his soul which is also the secret place of the Most High, he is no longer lonely, he no longer feels disturbed. From this vantage point nature seems less awesome, less immense. Man knows that he is larger than the whole of nature. He is greater than the whole objective world. All that science revealed now appears as petty compared with the enormousness of his self-realization in God. A serene self-confidence comes over him. New life sweeps into him. Creative desires surge within him. He yearns to go out, to go back to that outer world (no longer formidable) and do something with it. He goes! And God goes with him!

After a time he comes back, tired, broken, discouraged. And God is waiting for him as he comes!

CHAPTER X

RECONSIDERATION OF THE THEORY OF PROGRESS

We are now ready to undertake the reconsideration of the theory of progress, which we outlined in the second chapter of this discussion. In that outline we were content to establish the fact of progress as it is evidenced by the general tendency of human development and, especially, as it appears in contemporary civilization. Our present undertaking will lead us to an explanation or definition of progress in relation to the critical and creative reason. In other words, we shall endeavour to establish the meaning of progress as over against the mere fact itself.

We have defined objective reality as being a continuum in space-time, reported by the senses and interpreted by the reason. In like manner, we have defined subjective reality as being a continuum outside space-time, reported by the intuition and interpreted by the reason. The reason, thus, is established as occupying an exactly similar

relation to the objective and the subjective fields. It stands, so to speak, above science and religion—looking down at them from a position of relative aloofness. It has no stake in either, it belongs to neither, it is independent of both. Its attitude toward the scientific and the mystical is equally detached but also equally interested. The reason has no axe to grind; but it is given a task to accomplish.

Through the effort of the reason alone man has been taught to disentangle his two worlds one from the other. Without its aid he must have continued to exist in a maddening maze of confusion, unconscious of the sharp distinction that lies between sensory and spiritual experience; and whenever its aid is refused and this distinction is forgotten, man falls back into the maze.

The intepretation that the reason offers of objective and subjective phenomena becomes inevitably the standard by which man must measure his grasp or understanding of experience. In other words, when the reason interprets the visual experience of light from the sun as being a vision of Phœbus Apollo, man must, forsooth, accept that dictum as authoritative. And when the reason alters its interpretation and declares that the same experience is one of the impingement of rapidly moving granular light rays upon the external rods

and cones of the bacillary layer of the retina, causing the transmission of the image to the brain by the optic nerve—then man must accept this later declaration as authoritative.

Or, again, when the reason (now engaged upon subjective experience) explains man's intuition of the Absolute as being the discovery of Jahveh of Hosts whose throne is upon Mount Sinai, there is nothing to be done save to accept the reason's word as final. But, however, when the reason explains that this same intuition was not that of Jahveh on Sinai, but rather that of a universal Heavenly Father, then man must give heed to the altered voice.

From the critical and creative reason there is no appeal.

To put the matter plainly, the reason speaks the ultimate word about all experience—sensory and spiritual. What the reason declares man must believe. When the reason modifies or extends its conclusions man must follow on. For through the reason alone man is able to judge of the meaning and value of experience.

We are now about to lay down an hypothesis—and it is the reason which lays it down—namely: *That progress, both objective and subjective, is a manifestation of the refinement of the reason in relation to sensory and spiritual experience.* The

reason is, at this point, dealing with itself; engaging, as it were, in a bit of self-analysis.

"What am I?" inquires the reason.

The answer is, "I am progress!"

Can this contention be supported? Let the reason inquire further of itself.

Certain experiences of outward phenomena have been shared by all mankind from the time when man became man. These remain unaltered to-day; and they are common both to highly civilized man and to men of more primitive culture. Experiences of heat, cold, light, darkness, hunger, starvation, pain, pleasure, wakefulness, sleep—all these and many more are the universal portion of man's experience. The outer world is fundamentally the same to-day as it was three hundred thousand years ago or three million years ago; and man's sensory system is practically the same now as it was then. The eye, the ear, the senses of taste, touch, and smell, are for all practical purposes unchanged. Man is, therefore, found to be living now in the same objective world as that in which his prehistoric ancestors lived.

The outer world, aside from man, records no progress that we can measure. The sensory system shows no improvement that we can discover.

Yet—man's life on the planet is certainly not the same! Man has progressed.

In the same objective world the same objective man still resides. But in this unchanged world this unchanged man has changed!

Wherein lies the secret?

The reason declares that the secret lies within itself. The history of progress is the record of the refinement of the reason. It is the story of a constantly improving interpretation of experience.

It goes without peradventure that progress in man's outer world is a fact; and the contention of this discussion is that inward progress, while less apparent, may also be discovered if one will seek it in the right way. We need not, therefore, recapitulate the argument found in Chapter Two. Material advancement on the one hand, and spiritual enlargement upon the other, seem to have accompanied mankind down the long and winding corridor of history.

Yet the reports brought in from the outer world by the senses, and from the inner world by the intuition, have not varied at all during the period of man's existence as man. Nature is unchanged. God is unchanged. The senses are no more acute nor is the intuition more searching. It is only the reason that has undergone a gradual refinement. Evolution, so far as man is concerned, is the growth of the critical and creative reason.

Dealing with the same experience from epoch

to epoch the reason has refined upon the interpretations which it has had to offer.

An objection may be raised at this point by those who say that the invention and use of instruments for the extension of sensory experience has literally changed the appearance of the objective world. The answer is that these instruments are the invention of the reason. Man might have had their use at any time—if his reason had been ready to provide them!

Why did not the Pharaohs broadcast messages from the top of the Great Pyramid to Crete or Babylon? Why did not Alexander conquer Persia by airplanes? Why did not Cæsar invade Gaul in motor lorries or attack the Germans in tanks? Why was not the foundation of St. Peter's dug with a steam shovel? Why did Columbus cross the Atlantic in a sailboat? Why could not Chopin or Liszt make phonograph records of their masterpieces? Why did so many men need to die in the Civil War from infection? Why could not De Lesseps have stamped out yellow fever in the Panama Zone? Why were Ford cars not available in the days of the covered wagon? Why should not earlier astronomers have watched the skies through powerful lenses?

Such questions are entirely appropriate, because the physical conditions for every single one of

these steps in progress were present ten thousand years ago. The only element lacking was a critical and creative reason sufficiently refined to discover the conditions and appropriate them for man's service.

The only element that has been added is that of a highly refined reason. Progress is, thus, seen to be a phenomenon associated with the development of the reason.

The technique is that of discriminating analysis, issuing in a new synthesis. What, after all, is a telescopic lens but the product of carefully analytic study of a series of laws and the application of the study to their synthesis in a certain particular body of matter? Involved in this comprehensive task is an amount of exact calculation and painstaking work which would discourage the average person. Yet—the reason has achieved it. And the reason has achieved, from the use of such a lens, a wonderful store of knowledge as to the nature and constitution of the space-time world.

The space-time world has not changed. The laws that govern the world have not changed. Man's eye and brain structure have not changed. The reason alone has changed. And this is progress!

Throughout the entire range of man's outward experience there have been brought to pass the

most unexpected alterations, especially during the last two or three centuries, simply because the critical and creative reason has entered a new phase of development. To no other cause can it be attributed.

Modern science is, therefore, an effect of the reason's refinement, as are also modern business and modern industry. That which science has accomplished is a by-product of the reason's creative activity. Science may well be called an offspring of the refined reason. It is the reason at work in the objective world. The expansion of scientific knowledge and the extension of its influence are, accordingly, a phase of that remarkable subtilization of the reason's approach to outward phenomena which has come to pass. It is an external evidence of a great refinement of the interpretation given to sensory experience.

The reason deals with subjective reality, always, as it does with the objective world. It treats its evidences with careful and penetrating analysis. The farther religion travels from expressing itself in crudity and fanaticism or from the effort to employ coercive means for self-propagation, the more certain it is that the reason has achieved a great refinement. But this does not mean that, when religion is regarded as being a shadowy and vaguely imaginary reminiscence, the reason

has been active upon it. On the contrary, the more vague and shadowy religion becomes, the more certain it is that the reason has ignored it. This must be kept in mind at all times, because it is the habit of many educated people to-day to mistake the effects of materialistic overemphasis for those of the critical reason. Indeed, science is often supposed to be the sole exemplar of the reason's achievement; whereas science is only one (the objective) manifestation of the reason's refinement in the interpretation of experience. Religion is the other and equally important manifestation. If and when science usurps the place of its parent, the reason, in an attempt to interpret religious intuition, science has committed a crime against the soul of man! And the soul of man cries out upon science and appeals to the reason against an irksome tyranny.

Science cannot replace the reason, as religion cannot! Science and religion are the twin heirs of the reason, each in its own realm. But the heirs can never legitimately achieve the throne. The reason is and must remain sovereign.

This statement doubtless demands further elaboration, to which we shall proceed. There is a technique for the interpretation of objective phenomena as reported by the senses. This technique is called scientific. There is also a technique for the

interpretation of subjective phenomena as reported by the intuition. This is called religious.

Let us use a simple illustration. A man feels a sharp pain in his shoulder. He knows that something is physically wrong. He examines the shoulder to find out what has happened, but can discover no sign of any trouble. The pain, however, continues and he consults a physician, who questions him and sends him to a dentist. The dentist, in turn, sends him to a colleague who takes an X-ray photograph of his teeth. An infection is located, the dentist removes the tooth, and in due time the pain in the shoulder ceases to trouble. This is the scientific method. If the first diagnosis had failed other possibilities would have been explored. It happened in this case that the infected tooth was responsible for a rheumatic condition that first showed itself in the shoulder.

To illustrate the religious method we may select another case. A man has lost the capacity to experience the reality of his inner world. While he still believes in God, his belief is merely theoretical or abstract. The outer world has swallowed up his interest and he lives almost exclusively in a material environment. Religion has gone over to the enemy and is now only a formal matter. He attends church occasionally but is bored by it. He scarcely ever prays and when he does so the prayer

is empty of spiritual meaning. He has begun to wonder whether the soul is not, after all, a concept carried over for animism. He turns to psychology and to books about religious history for light upon his perplexity. But he is not satisfied. He wishes that he had his inner world back again. Then he decides to get it back. He ceases to wonder about God and instead prays to Him. He keeps on praying in spite of discouragement. He pushes the outer world back, at intervals, and broods within himself over deep matters. He cultivates the companionship of those whose souls to them a kingdom are. He goes to church and now is stirred. He reads the literature of authentic mysticism. He develops a liking for the greater poets. He finds, at length, that in periods of silence and solitude there come to him intimations of his soul's restoration. And then, in some moment of illumination, he recognizes the presence of God and knows that he has regained his inner world. This is the technique of religion.

How plain it is that science and religion must employ two entirely different methods. And how natural it is that to the religious consciousness the scientific treatment seems cold and matter-of-fact, while to the scientific mind the religious treatment appears to be sentimental. It is only as the reason stands above both science and religion to judge

impartially and critically between them, that a man escapes the inclination to accept one or the other method as his own and to repudiate the discarded one as beneath his notice. To the reason both are correct so long as they function each in its own field; just as both are improper when they trespass beyond their own particular boundaries.

Whereas material progress is measured quantitatively, spiritual progress is measured qualitatively. That is to say, spiritual progress is a matter of soul enrichment and may be gauged by the development of man's appreciation of the qualities of Goodness, Truth, Beauty, and Love, which are apprehended by intuition and summed up in God.

The reality of such progress can be demonstrated, and we endeavoured to indicate it in the second chapter. The chief limitation upon inward development to-day is found in the objective overemphasis; and yet this has not been entirely effective as a barrier or restriction. Man, on the whole, is more ready to appreciate soul values, is potentially more aware of God, than he ever was in times past. The transcendent dream of humanity is more commonly shared to-day than ever. Spiritual aspiration is undoubtedly more universal although less clearly defined; and the inward realm

beckons, even to the materialistic West, more enticingly than ever.

If this is true it speaks eloquently of the refinement of the reason in its interpretative work upon subjective experience. If man's capacity for contact with God seems, when actually exercised, to be increasing in depth and significance, it is because his reason has become more subtle and delicate in analyzing the contact. God has not changed. Man's soul has not altered. But the reason has grown in refinement.

To the primitive reason, modern spiritual culture is lacking in robustness and ferocity. It is too quiet, too reserved, too self-contained. There is no fanaticism in it, and its missionary zeal has grown less bigoted. Religion to-day, in its progressive manifestation, fails to arouse that bitterness of partisanship and that hatred of the infidel which have traditionally accompanied the more profound subjective experiences of mankind. In other words, contemporary spirituality resembles more nearly that of Buddha, Jesus, St. Francis, Erasmus, and Emerson than that of Moses, Mohammed, Martin Luther, Calvin, and Cromwell. And this is religious progress. A deeper realization of the Absolute quickens man's apprehension of the qualities of which the Absolute is compact: the qualities of perfect Goodness, Truth, Beauty,

and Love. And as the apprehension of these qualities is quickened, man's soul is understood by the reason to be, like God, compact of absolute Goodness, Truth, Beauty, and Love. From this, then, it follows that a subtler analysis is made of what Goodness in the Absolute must be, and of what Truth and Beauty and Love in God most assuredly are. Whereupon the refined reason postulates for man in his subjective experience a cosmic consciousness far and away more acute than the manifold sorts of spiritual understanding which have been crystallized into the historically objective forms of church and creed.

The reason tells man that he has never fully realized what his experience of God might mean to him. The reason shows him that God is undefinable, and yet quite within the compass of his inner comprehension. It explains to him that all of the specific definitions of God, and all the theories as to His Nature, have fallen short of the truth. It urges him to desist from any further effort to devise a formula or to develop a creed in which to imprison the Absolute. This is sheer folly and serves only to circumscribe the soul in its activity. Let the soul have its way, the reason advises. Let the soul and God meet as they must meet, in spirit and in truth. And let the inner world reveal itself as it will through the intuition. Heed the testimony

of the intuition and trust its report. But do not overheed the testimony of other men when they offer their interpretations of intuitive experience. Listen to their testimony with respect, value it as the best that they can offer; but in the last analysis let no one's judgment, save that of the most sensitive and penetrating intelligences whom you know, influence your own opinion.

And beware, always, of the encroachment of objective and scientific viewpoints upon the viewpoint of your soul! "Your soul," says the reason, "speaks to me and I alone am in a position to interpret what it says. Let me, then, give you my interpretation. I have created science and in my refinement I have brought progress to the outer world. I also have created religion and in my refinement have given progress to the inner world. Progress is the manifestation of my influence as I have grown in subtlety and sensitiveness. I shall continue to grow. Let be! Let science be in its place and let religion be in its place. Oh, soul of man! Explore in your own right. Find God! Find Perfection! And report to me what you find that I may teach you to realize yourself even as I teach man's body to realize itself. So shall I, at length, teach both you and man's body to live creatively in the mysterious ranges where the unfathomable wisdom of God has placed you!"

Thus does the reason speak to man's inner life. And what is this reason that speaks so confidently? We have called it a critical and creative faculty, above both science and religion, which moves in both the objective and the subjective worlds with equal facility. We have indicated the manner in which it separates the two worlds and, having separated them, interprets them. We have shown that its refinement is the basis and the structure of progress. But we have not, as yet, proven what intrinsically the reason is. Perhaps we cannot do so. Perhaps this task is beyond our ability.

But we may, at any rate, devote a chapter to an attempt to describe more fully the nature and significance of this, man's most important ally in his struggle to live in the two conflicting worlds of his experience. This we shall do in the succeeding chapter.

Before we commence, however, let us be prepared for a strange discovery. What if it should turn out that the critical and creative reason were something belonging to a *third world of experience* —a world embracing both the objective and the subjective, and one in which man in his further development must learn to live as a unified and integrated personality.

CHAPTER XI

THE WORK OF THE CRITICAL AND CREATIVE REASON

BEFORE we proceed further we must pause for a few words of confession. We must confess to the inadequacy of language as the vehicle of expression for such concepts as we have been trying to state. Language is the outgrowth of space-time experience, and all of its terms are founded upon realities discovered in the outer world. Difficulty is encountered, as a matter of course, whenever an effort is made to clothe the soul's realities in verbal dress. This is especially true when the dress is that of didactic prose. Poetry serves better; but we are committed in this discussion to the prosaic form and shall do the best with it that is possible.

We come now to an endeavour to find out, if we may, what is the intrinsic character of the critical and creative reason—and what is its ultimate task.

Our senses report upon experiences of the ob-

jective world, and the reason interprets the report in terms of three-dimensional space passing through time. Our intuition reports of the subjective world, and the reason interprets the report in terms of a nondimensional continuum unconnected with time. How does, or can, the reason discriminate between the two continua? Is the reason an objective or is it a subjective phenomenon? Does the reason function in space-time or is it free from spatial and temporal limitations?

We have spoken of "the refinement of the reason." Does this not imply a duration in time? How may we understand a process of refinement without first recognizing a certain movement from one stage to another? If the reason is more refined in 1920 A. D. than it was in 1920 B. C., is it not obvious that this refinement has proceeded at a certain rate of acceleration during a period of 3840 years?

On the other hand, however, the reason is certainly not a spatial or a temporal phenomenon. It possesses no physical form or size. Its functioning cannot be timed by a clock. It is not governed by the laws that govern material bodies. It is able to comprehend the ideas of eternity and infinity, which are actually nontemporal and nonspatial conceptions.

The reason stands in a peculiar position. It is the interpreter of space-time experience, and it is

equally the interpreter of experience which is non-spatial and nontemporal. It is native to neither of man's worlds. To what world, then, does it belong?

The reason of Einstein, of Spengler, of Keyserling, of Henry Ford, of Freud, of Watson, of Fosdick and of Edna St. Vincent Millay—to what world do these belong? To what world did (or does) the reason of Socrates belong? Or of Jesus? Or of St. Augustine? Or of Napoleon? Or of Darwin? Or of Lincoln? Or of Whitman?

At home in two worlds, yet confined to neither, the critical and creative reason seems to defy our effort to find its sphere.

Yet perhaps this is necessarily so; because, after all, it is the reason that is trying to find itself—to interpret itself. Which, probably, it cannot do.

This, however, emerges: namely, that the reason represents a phase of experience neither sensory nor mystical, but superior to both, encompassing both. Of this the reason is convinced, because it can enter one field or the other with equal facility and can separate and reunite both fields by analysis and a new synthesis.

It is not our plan to engage in speculation and we shall, therefore, refrain from further inquiry as to the explicit nature of the reason, leaving the matter where, ultimately, all matters must be

left: namely, in the realm of unexplained mystery. The reason cannot explain objective nature, although it can interpret it. Nor can the reason explain the soul and God, although it can interpret them. Nor can the reason explain man's dilemma (its cause, its meaning), although it can help man to see it through and finally to overcome it. Nor can the reason explain itself, although it can function successfully in man's experience.

This the reason can lay down, however—that it is the *organizing consciousness and the prime factor of personality.*

The reason, in other words, *is man at his best, living in two worlds and reaching toward another.* The manner of his reach is shown by the way in which he interprets experience both objective and subjective. Man's science and man's religion *together* are the expression of his struggle to outgrow himself! He stretches into space-time and he broods down into the Absolute, becoming thereby a nascent personality and entering thus a phase of experience superior both to the materialistic on the one hand and to the mystical on the other. He is neither materialist nor mystic but a *new creature,* a higher man!

He is no materialist, although his understanding and employment of material agencies give him a command over objective nature which is

relatively stupendous. We should say that his command is unqualifiedly stupendous save for the fact that in relation to the total force of the outer world man's mechanical control is that of a pygmy! It is only in comparison with his physical weakness and with the infinitesimal place that his body occupies in the universe, that man's scientific mastery is great. But according to this comparison his achievement is staggering! So far as his life upon the earth is concerned man has made it over. And within less than ten generations he has completely revolutionized his own conception of the very structure of the outward world.

He can measure distances extending millions of miles. He can calculate speeds to a rapidity of 186,000 miles per second. He has been able to discover what are the chemical constituents of the sun. He can predict the exact position of every star in every constellation at any given moment for thousands of years to come. He knows when a comet must appear and when it has appeared in past times. His information about the objective world in space is almost that of omniscience—and he is learning all of the time.

He, moreover, has been able to analyze the material structure of the universe to the point of breaking up an atom and segregating its constituents, the protons and the electrons. In this achieve-

ment he has dealt with physical bodies too minute even for his imagination to conceive.

He now speaks matter-of-factly about his understanding in such general terms as chemistry, physics, biology, biochemistry, astronomy, astrophysics, anthropology, paleontology, geology, mineralogy, and so on. Each one of these words represents a process of growth in scientific understanding so amazing as to stupefy the brain of anyone, not scientifically oriented, who should undertake in an evening's reading to grasp a small fraction of it. Let the average layman take up any truly scientific work and try to master its contents. He will put it down in flat discouragement. Its most elementary hypotheses are beyond him. Yet he will hear the words "chemistry" or "physics" without a tremor, since he is accustomed to realize that some men there are who have discovered and who know many mysterious things about the world that he can never hope to grasp.

He is cheered and heartened, however, by the fact that these very things are put within his grasp for practical utility by men who convert scientific knowledge into mechanical instruments. Man, in his higher objective reach, conducts his everyday life under the auspices of scientific invention. And who can say that he has more than entered upon the threshold of his possibility? He

has, apparently, just commenced to utilize the forces that are at the disposal of his desire. Who knows what lies ahead for man to uncover and to use? He, higher man, is on the march! The critical and creative reason is reaching out farther and farther!

Yet he is no materialist, if he be truly higher man, for there is another field awaiting his exploration to which he must turn. Nor is he on the other hand a mystic, since he has not ignored the outer world. The true mystic must devote himself exclusively to spiritual exercises, and treat objective phenomena as if they were nonexistent. The man of developed reason, thus, cannot be a mystic, even though he brood within his soul as deeply as a Hindu sage! For brood he must! And he must brood more deeply than any sage in any previous time or in any less outwardly progressive civilization. He must deepen his mystical experience beyond the depth attained by any mystic. His religious command must be, in the subjective world, as relatively stupendous as is his scientific command in the outer world! He must be spiritually as profound as scientifically he is brilliant. He must be as opulent of soul as he is prosperous of body; as cultivated within as he is civilized without. He must be as great in prayer as he is great in research and invention! Otherwise he will not be higher

man, the new creature, the coherently integrated man of critical and creative reason!

It requires both science and religion to provide the stuff of the full-grown personality. Science in its field and religion in its, together combine in the refined reason to make the man who is fit or able to live in the *third world* of creative experience: he who is equipped to enter the realm which is both objective and subjective, and yet which is neither, but more than the sum of each!

In working upon the world of inner experience, the reason proceeds to refine upon its former interpretations. Here it finds itself under the necessity of carrying spiritual intuition over into the realm of spatial and temporal reality! That is, while the reason can readily apprehend the soul's awareness, it cannot interpret mysticism otherwise than in relative and objective terms.

The reason has no difficulty in conceiving the qualities of absolute Goodness, Truth, Beauty, and Love as they are met in God. The difficulty arises when an effort is made to translate the conception into language or any other external symbolism. At this point the reason must struggle with itself, especially in an age when scientific terminology has so thoroughly preëmpted the field of expression.

The tragedy of human life is all summed up in

this difficulty of the critical and creative reason. To refine upon the interpretation of objective experience and to state the new interpretation through science, is comparatively easy. But adequately to present the results of refinement in spiritual interpretation is a grievous matter! For, as we have said, spiritual experience is nonspatial and nontemporal. How shall the reason speak of it? Indeed, how shall the reason be sure that its claim to refinement of interpretation is more than an illusion of the sensory world? Is the reason, when dealing with religion, able to change, to grow, to evolve, to progress? We have declared that the reason has made progress in this range. But were we justified in so doing? If there can be progress in spiritual understanding, does it not follow that spirituality itself is a creature of time duration?

Here, momentarily, we are involved in utter confusion. We think that spiritual progress is a reality, but we say that spiritual reality lies outside the passage of time. We know that the reason has actually become more refined in its spiritual interpretations, but this knowledge challenges our belief that mystical intuition is beyond the scope of *becoming!* Mysticism discovers that which *is* and is conscious of nothing that *was* or *is to be*. Mysticism hears God say, "I am the Alpha and the Omega,

the beginning and the end. I am that I am!" And yet the reason itself is a *becoming;* otherwise it could not develop! How can the reason deal with that which only *is,* and yet refine upon its dealing, save only as it admits itself to be limited to temporal and spatial bounds?

Our logic fails us, and we are confronted by the inexplicable secret of existence. What shall we do about it?

We can do nothing at all save to accept the mystery as inexplicable, and to employ the reason as best we may upon the task of interpretation, acknowledging frankly the limitations that restrict our thought.

Whereupon the confusion comes clear and we realize that as a mediator between two worlds of experience the reason must necessarily share in the characteristics of each. It belongs to space-time and it belongs to non-space-time. It is fastened to the relative and is bound up with the Absolute. It is of the body and it is of the soul. It is human and it is Divine. It must speak two languages. And its refinement in the outer life is of a very different sort from its refinement in God.

Outer life is relative. Spirituality is absolute. The reason is both relative and absolute. It deals scientifically with relative experience. It deals religiously with absolute experience.

Progress subjectively, therefore, is unlike progress objectively. Objective progress must be measured *historically* in relationship of epoch to epoch. Subjective progress must be measured *introspectively* in relationship to the status existing between man's soul and man's senses. Outward progress lies in the field of relation between objective man and nature. Inward progress is a matter of relationship between subjective man and his outer necessity.

The refinement of the reason as it seeks to interpret spiritual experience, accordingly, is proven by the manner in which it mediates between the seen and the unseen. In other words, the refined reason is that which makes most possible a coherent and integrated human life in both the outer and the inner relationships. Higher man is he who recognizes and accepts his two worlds, realizes the inevitable conflict between them, and yet lives in them both with equal zest and capacity, thus overcoming his difficulty and dehorning his dilemma!

Achievement, to higher man, turns out at last to be a workable technique of the reason in two relationships, that with nature and that with God.

In order that this technique should be rational, the outward life must have become subject to the refined reason and science must have

grown great. But the outward life must have, also, been confined in its influence to strictly objective fields. The position and sphere of science must have been defined, and science must have been restricted to that sphere. Then the inward life must have been limited in the same way, and mysticism must have been kept from encroaching upon scientific territory. These things having been accomplished, the reason is able to take the soul's intuition of God and relate it to an experience of nature; in other words, *teaching man to discover God in nature,* not figuratively now, but literally, even as God is discovered literally in the subjective realm. The discovery of God in nature, to higher man, is the discovery of God in the nature which science explains. But it is not the discovery of God in nature through science. This must be kept carefully in mind. Science cannot possibly discover God anywhere, since it is not in the technique of science to do so. And when scientists lay claim to such a discovery they err. Only the man who has discovered God *subjectively,* and who has learned to recognize God as Absolute, can come to nature with the proper faculties for ascertaining God's presence there.

God is found through prayer, meditation, and worship. Persistent prayer, deep brooding, and the outreach of the soul in worship will reveal God

to any man. Prayer and meditation open the soul to objective intuition, and comprise the two elements in the technique of religion. Worship, on the other hand, is man's means of realizing God in the outer world.

The refined reason is thus found to exercise itself upon the subjective phase through a more excellent expression of the whole life in worship. Worship is and must be objective. In worship the separation of the inner and the outer realms is overcome. Worship is the bridge between man's dream of Perfection and his realization of life's outward limitations. Worship and worship alone can bind the two worlds together.

We are able now to understand why and in what manner the reason refines itself and makes spiritual progress possible. Prayer and meditation admit of no improvement. More men may pray, to be sure, and more men may meditate. But they either pray and meditate or they do not. There are no "better" prayers nor "finer" meditations. It is only as prayer and meditation fulfil themselves in the outer symbols of worship that progress can be marked. For worship, while subjective in origin, expresses itself outwardly. Progress in worship can be achieved, and the refined reason is its achieving agent.

When we say, therefore, that there has been

subjective progress we mean that there has been improvement in man's general capacity for worship. And by this we mean that man has found God in nature so much more adequately and so much more reasonably that his whole attitude toward the outer world is more reverent, more penetrating, and more patient; and that he is therefore more willing than ever before to accept nature on its own terms. Its contradictions and its cruelties, as well as its orderliness and its bounties, are understood to lie in the peculiar constitution of man's sensory experience. They are not, it is realized, resident in God nor even in nature as such. They are the testimony of the five senses as to the character of the outer world. The reason, interpreting this testimony and coördinating it with that of the intuition, resolves the difficulty by saying: *"The report of the senses I shall publish in a volume called 'Science.' That of the intuition I shall gather into a book called 'Religion.' The two I shall bind into one work and that I shall call 'Worship.' This completed work will serve as the textbook of human experience. It will be a guide to man's highest achievement."*

Worship is, undoubtedly, man's supreme attainment; for through worship his whole experience is knit together into one. Let come what may in sensory experience, the worshipful man must recog-

nize in it the hand of an Absolute God, whom he has learned to know and love and trust within his soul. Let be revealed what may in subjective experience, the worshipful man will seek its equivalent in nature. The Kingdom of Heaven within will become the pattern of a City of God on earth. Spiritual perfection will be the inspiration for outward striving. And all the outer life will be the symptom of an inner health, showing itself in a breathless sense of wonder which is, intrinsically, the mood of worship.

And worship will be known as more than spirituality, more than mysticism, more even than religion. Worship will be perceived to function in all of man's pursuits—in his conduct, his work, his love, and his thought. Worship will be the outward man and the inward man combined to make higher man! Worship is and must be the fervent outreach of the whole personality toward a *third world of experience,* beyond the scientific, beyond the purely mystical—a world of experience where two worlds ultimately merge into one.

Is not worship, thus, in its final term, the hunger and thirst of man for a world wherein he may become more than man? And is not worship, thus, the expression of man's indomitable desire for immortality and his unquenchable faith in its possibility?

The senses know nothing of immortality. The soul possesses it already. But man in two worlds, man of flesh and man of soul combined, desires it and yet has it not! Only through worship does man feel that as man—not as disembodied spirit, but as man—he may ever attain to eternal life.

By finding the Absolute in nature as he has found Him in his soul, man realizes that he can overcome death!

We come to the end of this chapter, through many a maze of confusion, with a great conviction upon us. It is the conviction that man's critical and creative reason represents a tendency toward life that lies beyond the range both of science and of religion. But in order that this tendency should be given its proper direction it has been necessary that the reason refine upon sensory experience, through science; and that it refine upon intuitive experience through religion—creating thus out of science and religion the elements of high worship. By so doing, the reason abolishes the duality of man's world and brings it into unity. The conflict between science and religion on their own levels must still go on. The report of the senses and that of the soul will always contradict each other. The scientist as scientist must remain objective. The mystic as mystic must remain subjective. But man in worship is more than scientist or mystic—he is

an organized and unified personality in a universe where God and nature are at one. Through worship man is saved from his dilemma. And great worship is possible only when religion and science stand over against each other in equal right.

CHAPTER XII

WORSHIP AND THE RECOVERY OF RELIGION

THE preceding chapter ended with the declaration: *Through worship man is saved from his dilemma.* Our task in bringing this discussion to its close will be to make the above assertion good. Success or failure to do this will determine the success or the failure of our argument for the recovery of religion.

How can spiritual progress be measured? It can be measured only by the quality and character of man's inward dream as it is expressed in the outer world. There can be no progress in subjective experience as it is gained through the strictly introvertive technique of prayer and meditation. The prayer and the meditation of a Hindu mendicant, an African savage, an immature child, or a highly trained research scholar are essentially and spiritually of equal value, so long as they are equally heartfelt and sincere. The only spiritual difference that can be found between these types must be sought in the various methods by which they ob-

jectify their inner life. When one contends, therefore, that the reason has become more refined in its interpretation of subjective experience, he must demonstrate that man's worshipful outer life has grown more subtle, more luminous, and more rational in the modern period.

But we have already asserted our conviction that the reason has become more refined in dealing with the Absolute; or, in other words, that subjective progress has accompanied objective progress into our present age. This we claimed, in spite of the striking failure of religion to maintain itself in man's vital interest during the period when science has been pushing into every realm of thought and action. We argued that man's spiritual *potentiality* is greater to-day than ever before, although objective preoccupations have prevented him from exploiting his spiritual resources to any degree approximating their full possibility. We stated our belief that subjective aspiration is more general and that the inward realm beckons, even to the materialistic West, more enticingly than ever. We said that more men are ready to share the dream of Perfection than ever shared it in any preceding age. This is our steadfast conviction.

Yet how may we prove ourselves to be other than sentimentalists who insist that, because they desire a thing to be, therefore and for that reason

it is? Can our conviction bear the strain of rational analysis? We are, at any rate, willing to find out.

The crux of the matter lies in our definition of worship; for it can be only through worship that men display their real spiritual quality for other men to notice and discern.

What, then, is worship? In the preceding chapter we defined it as *the fervent outreach of the whole personality toward a third world of experience.* We may now particularize upon that definition.

Science is the improved technique of man's outreach to the world of space-time, the objective world. Religion is the technique of man's reach into the world of the Absolute, the subjective world. Worship, starting from religion and accepting the world of science, is the upreach of man toward a third world which includes both the relative and the Absolute, both the objective and the subjective; a world in which he may overcome his difficulty, escape his dilemma, and actually gain personal immortality by rising above death.

The essential characteristic of worship is a sense of the wondrous, or an attitude of reverent awe before the mystery of existence. The most important phase of its technique is the general tendency to project intuitive spiritual experience into the outer world by means of symbols.

In the light of this description, can the contention be supported that man's worship has improved during the latter years? Is the sense of the wondrous more exalted? Is reverence before the mystery of life more grave? Are the symbols of inner experience more luminous and at the same time more rational?

Where shall we find the affirmative answer to these questions? Not, certainly, in those churches where religion is quite largely a survival pattern of a former spirituality! Not, certainly, where science has foisted its technique upon the soul and has thus enslaved it. Nor, assuredly, among those who are so energetically looking for substitutes to take the place of religion. Nor, even, where mysticism broods down into the Absolute and will not trust itself to emerge into the out-of-doors. Not in these places shall we find affirmation.

We must seek it where men of integrated personality live their lives fully and eagerly within and without, and who seek, through the refinement of their reason, a life more abundant, more rich, more varied, and more enthralling than that either of materialist or of mystic—a life, that is, which leaps to the challenge of exploration in a world undiscovered save by those undaunted pioneers who dare beyond their fellows and thus reach the edge of its domain!

Man's outer life may be lived in either of two moods. It may be lived in the practical, so-called "common-sense" mood, or it may be lived in the spirit of poetical or sacramental aspiration. The one is strictly objective and conforms to the restrictions imposed by the five senses in space-time. The other is symbolical, stretching the restricted outer world beyond its ordinary bounds, and imparting to it qualities of transcendence. This latter mood is correctly suggested by Edna St. Vincent Millay at the conclusion of her poem, "Renascence," as follows:

"The world stands out on either side
No wider than the heart is wide;
Above the world is stretched the sky,—
No higher than the soul is high.
The heart can push the sea and land
Farther away on either hand;
The soul can split the sky in two
And let the face of God shine through.
But East and West will pinch the heart
That cannot keep them pushed apart;
And he whose soul is flat—the sky
Will close in on him by and by."

Here is set forth the worshipful attitude toward nature. According to these terms, man's subjective experience is able to widen and to exalt his experience in the outer world by the efficacy of a

spiritual command. And what is this spiritual command but the mastery by man's critical and creative reason of the dualism of his life through the technique of great worship? It is the worshipful man who can dominate nature to the extent of actually pushing distance apart and of splitting space-time in twain! And, what is more, it is the worshipful man who alone can apprehend the meaning of such poetical lines; which to the strictly scientific understanding are little more than words gracefully put together, entirely without valuable significance.

The man of worship (that is, he who projects his inward experience of Perfection out upon the stage of daily life) is able to discern in the world that the senses reveal intimations of a world not unlike that which has been revealed to him by intuition within his soul. He discovers in nature, and in all the processes of nature including his own activities, what mght be called the shadow or reflection of the Absolute. The earth, the sky, the sun and moon and stars, he may conceive to be animated, as it were, by an indwelling Spirit; which is resident in growing things as well—trees, shrubs, flowers, or blades of grass. To such a one Mrs. Browning's dictum is obviously true, that:

". . . Earth's crammed with heaven
And every common bush afire with God."

Or he can share with Lanier the conviction that

"Now in each pettiest personal sphere of dew
The summ'd morn shines complete as in the blue
Big dew-drop of all heaven: with these lit shrines
O'er-silvered to the farthest sea-confines,
The sacramental marsh one pious plain
Of worship lies . . ."

To the worshipful man such fanciful interpretations of sensory experience are beautifully and profoundly true; more true, indeed, than are the interpretations offered of the same experience by science. The poet, in this opinion, is able to ascertain with far greater accuracy than the scientist what are the essential elements of reality in the outer as well as the inner realm. While in no wise discounting the value and even the necessity of organizing knowledge upon a severely objective basis for practical purposes, the man of critical and creative reason who has recovered religion desires to interpret his space-time discoveries in a more subtle and spiritually satisfactory manner. To him the outer world is more than a gigantic mechanism. It is a marvellous allegory told by the senses and understood by the God-aware reason. It is a speaking symbol. Of the natural phenomena which are reported to con-

sciousness by the sensory system, the worshipful man must say:

> "In reason's ear they all rejoice,
> And utter forth a glorious voice."

To such a man this is *reality;* the most compelling reality, indeed, of which he possesses knowledge!

What is more, the worshipful man finds Perfection to be symbolized in every field of human activity. Thus he seeks to fashion sacraments out of the ordinary stuff of daily routine, as well as out of the more attractive material from which are created the fine arts and romantic love. Every conceivable function of man's space-time existence has been sacramentalized by the worshipful reason. His eating and his sleeping, his work and his play, his social life and his economic systems, his love and his mating, his war and his peace, his sickness and his death—all have been clothed in spiritual dress to satisfy the demands of the soul. Worship has used these functions, thus spiritualized, as symbols of the Perfection which is first revealed through intuition; until practically no phase of life is entirely alien to the feeling of holiness.

It is only after an objective overemphasis has destroyed in man the sense of the wondrous and has reduced space-time experience to scientific matter-of-factness, that the symbolical or sacra-

mental quality departs the manifold interests and occupations of the race. So soon, therefore, as modern man shall recover religion, his outer life will regain the colour and flavour which have so largely gone from it in our time.

The most potent symbol which man has yet devised as the objective container of his inward Dream is that of the majestic hero who sums up in his titanic person every attribute which is held to be that of flawless humanity. Greater than the sun or moon and stars, more alluring than mountains and sacred trees, lovelier than any limpid stream, more inspiring than temples or cathedrals, more influential than any code of laws divinely given, is the figure of the Redeemer-Prince who comes to save the world. Every race, nearly, has pictured forth such a glorious One, and the Hebrews kept alive their hope and courage for centuries by reminding themselves, generation after generation, that there should some day come to their nation such a Messiah, the Anointed One, whose name should be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Almighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.

Such names as those of Hermes, Mithra, Buddha, and Zoroaster designate the Saviour-heroes of four great ethnic religions. While the name which has achieved unchallenged supremacy, that of Jesus Christ, carries with it the prestige

and power of the most commanding sacramental movement that has appeared in all history.

From a humble beginning in Galilee of Judæa the influence of Jesus Christ has extended itself during nineteen centuries of unbroken continuity throughout the inhabited world. His is to-day, indeed, "the Name which is above every name."

The highest and most exalted object of worship which man's critical and creative reason has thus far projected is the person and character of Jesus of Nazareth who is called the Christ. His career, his teachings, and his personality have been able to command the heartfelt admiration of many, even, who have not formally embraced Christianity or subscribed to the orthodox Christian world view. He has seemed to attract man's imagination by the very magnetic power of his spirit; so that, to-day, he outranks all other heroes.

As a phenomenon of worship, therefore, Jesus Christ occupies a position of primary importance; and our conclusions regarding him will have a determinative bearing upon the question which we asked earlier in this chapter: namely, Has man's worship improved during these latter years?

What, then, do we think of Jesus Christ?

Science, in undertaking to answer the question, must adhere to a strictly objective approach and

limit itself to the analysis of tradition from the standpoint of historical evidences.

Mysticism, in making reply, must remain within the subjective field and refrain from entering the battle ground of contention as to how much of the tradition is historical and how much legendary. If mysticism finds the Living Christ within man's soul, that is enough. Jesus, the biological man, is no affair of the mystic.

But the critical and creative reason, working upon both the scientific and the purely spiritual evidences, must deal with the phenomena that appear in both realms. Why, the reason must ask, has Jesus Christ come to represent to so vast a number of men the very epitome of Perfection? And why, it must further inquire, have so many interpretations and representations been offered of this transcendent hero?

Let us proceed to the study of the first question: Why has Jesus Christ come to represent the very epitome of Perfection?

We have already discovered that man, when he lives in two words and accepts his dilemma, seeks almost of necessity to project, through worship, his inward Dream of Perfection out into the world of space-time by means of symbols. This is the act by which he overcomes the dualism of experience. We have also suggested that the most potent sym-

bol that man has yet devised is that of the majestic hero or Redeemer-Prince, who sums up in his person every attribute which is held to be that of flawless humanity; and that of all such heroes Jesus Christ is the most commanding.

If this be true Jesus Christ, as an object of worship, is seen to be a projection of man's inward experience of the Absolute upon the screen of space-time experience. *He is, in other words, a spiritual reality and an historical myth.* He is the Perfect Man, the Paragon, as realized within the soul and as conceived by the creative reason in spatial and temporal dimensions. He represents the epitome of possible Perfection in a world of imperfection. He is the incarnation of the Absolute God.

As an object of historical study Jesus is no such thing as the above. Scientifically and objectively scrutinized he is a man who lived at such and such a time in Palestine, about whom has been woven a fabric of legend which it is the task of research scholars to strip away. That which is legendary in the record of his life must be segregated in order that what is "true" may be permitted to stand. Scholars may disagree to a certain extent as to what may be regarded as historical; but on the whole there is unanimity of mind as to the legendary character of the birth account, of the miracle

stories (with the possible exception of the healing miracles), and of the account of the resurrection literally understood. The teaching of Jesus and the chronology of his life must be subjected, also, to thorough criticism in order that historical accuracy may be approximated. Such is the technique of science in dealing with Jesus. To put the matter in a certain way, science separates Jesus from Christ and centres its attention upon Jesus.

Mysticism, however, separates Christ from Jesus and concentrates upon Christ. Mysticism pays no attention to Jesus, the historical person. It is concerned only with the Eternal Christ who is discovered by intuition as being a subjectively experienced emanation from the Absolute. We cannot here enter into an exhaustive study of the mystic's apprehension of Christ; but we may be certain that, from the standpoint of spiritual experience, Christ is very real to those who meet him within the secret places of the soul.

Worship, differing from mysticism as well as from science, unites Jesus and Christ. It is thus brought about that, to the worshipful man, Jesus Christ is at once a spiritual reality and an historical myth. And it is because the reality and the myth together comprise so remarkable a combination of all the attributes of perfected man, objective as well as subjective, that he whose name is given

to the myth-reality has come to represent the very epitome of Perfection.

Yet this epitome itself has undergone great alteration during the Christian era, and the Christ-ideal has changed. So that when men, as some do, claim to "understand Christ better than men did a hundred (or five hundred) years ago," they mean, more accurately, that *the eidolon of Perfection is better than it formerly was*. This is probably quite true.

It is probably true that modern men are able to project their inward Dream of Perfection upon the screen of space-time more luminously and more rationally than men have previously been able to do. It is more than probable that the capacity for worship possessed by contemporary man on the whole is greater than that possessed by man in any former period. It is, therefore, to be expected that the figure of Jesus Christ should rise in the minds of those who to-day are vitally interested in religion as well as in science, and whose critical and creative reason is highly refined, away above the figure of Jesus Christ as it arose in the minds of earlier men—or as it still arises in the minds of those whom someone has ironically described as "our contemporary ancestors."

Spiritual progress may be marked, as we are now in a position to realize, by the relative ex-

cellence, according to the most highly developed reason, of the image or myth of Jesus Christ which is projected by men at any given time.

The more able, wise, magnanimous, and beautiful the character of Jesus Christ is interpreted to be, the more noble, wise, magnanimous, and beautiful is the ideal character of the man or the race of men who so interpret it.

We must now turn for a moment to the problem presented by the Gospels which give us the only extant account of the supposed earthly life of Jesus. The problem which they present is this: If Jesus Christ is at once a spiritual reality and an historical myth how, in the first place, does it happen that the Gospel writers seem so sure of themselves in describing the actual events through which Jesus of Nazareth moved, and in reporting the teachings which he left behind? And in the second place, supposing that the account or report is not historically true in all details, how can it be claimed that modern man has reached a point of superiority over men who were able to conceive such a life and to invent such teachings?

Let us take up the two phases of the problem separately. The first phase must be handed over to scientific analysis for a determination of the answer. Such analysis brings in the verdict, founded upon painstaking research, that a certain amount

of the Gospel material appears to be historically verifiable, a certain amount doubtful, and the remainder palpably of legendary character. Yet every part is written with equal certainty. Verifiable fact, doubtful sections, and elements that are plainly unhistorical are all mixed in together and reported with serene confidence in the literal accuracy of the whole. How could the Gospel writers have so mingled fact and myth? The answer is almost obvious to the historically scientific mind. The Gospel writers lived and wrote at a time when the line of division between objective fact and imaginative mythology was unknown. This line has been discovered only recently. It was unrecognized in the Middle Ages. It is unrecognized as yet among those who remain outside the influence of scientific thought.

The Gospel writers were filled with a splendid certainty that no account of Jesus' life could do complete justice to the facts. It was their ambition apparently to approximate full justice so far as they were able. Not being embarrassed by considerations of literal accuracy, they could make use of legend and myth without compunction, so long as myth and legend served to point out to the readers that Jesus Christ was the Perfect Man, the Son of God, the Saviour Christ, who taught the principles of perfect living.

They were not writing a biography for the sake of publication. They were writing a treatise of propaganda for the sake of man's greater worship.

The second phase of the problem has to do with the question: How can it be claimed that modern man has reached a point of superiority over men who were able to conceive such a life and to invent such teachings?

The answer to this question may be put simply as follows: The character of Jesus as described by the Gospels, and the teaching reported in them, are in many cases self-contradictory and depend for meaning and value upon the interpretation given them by the reader.

This contradictory or ambiguous element in the Gospel narratives has been the occasion of no little disagreement among theologians and scholars and has led to the strange divergence of opinion as to Jesus' character and as to the meaning of his teaching which shows itself in the biographies which have been written.

Consider, for example, the difference between such modern biographies as those of Papini, Mary Austin, Klausner, Bouck White, Bruce Barton, Emil Ludwig, Middleton Murry, Professor Case, Dr. Bowie, and Kahlil Gibran. Scarcely any points in common may be discovered between them, ex-

cept those of name, nationality, and historical period.

Consider, moreover, the differences found in the Gospels themselves, both as to Jesus' teachings and as to his character. Matthew reports him to have said, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, the realm of heaven is theirs." While in exactly the same connection Luke reports him to have said, "Blessed are ye poor, the realm of God is yours." There is a vast difference between these enunciations. The one has to do with man's inner life; the other with man's outer condition. The one has a mystical flavour; the other is economic in its significance.

Or is it possible to harmonize in any satisfactory fashion the character of Jesus as portrayed in the Gospel according to John and the one given us by the Synoptics? There is practically nothing in common between them—as there is little in common between them and the Jesus Christ so vividly portrayed and so profoundly interpreted by Paul.

Jesus Christ is a composite character and his teachings are composite also. From this composition any interpreter may abstract those elements which he himself desires to emphasize and use for his own purposes. From which fact may be derived the conclusion that spiritual progress among any race or group of men at any time may be gauged

by the nature of the interpretation which they put upon the character and teaching of Jesus Christ as found in the Gospels and suggested by Paul.

On the whole, modern man tends to interpret the Jesus of the New Testament more luminously and more rationally than did his predecessors. That is, his critical and creative reason projects a more transcendent image of Perfection than former men, including the Gospel writers, have ever projected. The Jesus Christ worshipped by the more developed person of to-day is a nobler, wiser, more magnanimous, and more beautiful Person than is the Jesus Christ of the New Testament *taken as a whole*. The man of refined reason to-day selects those elements from the Gospel narrative which appeal to his most discriminating judgment and interprets them according to his most fastidious taste. The lesser elements he ignores, or else allegorizes into new meanings.

This process is usually cloaked under the disguise called "the rediscovery of Jesus." But there is no such thing as the rediscovery of Jesus. In reality it is the reinterpretation of Jesus Christ in terms of the refined reason. If Jesus Christ is being discovered to-day it is a new Jesus Christ who is being found—a Jesus Christ drawn in the image of Perfection by the more subtle and developed reason of contemporary man! The Jesus Christ of

modern biographers and of modern worshippers is the spiritual reality and historical myth of modern men. He belongs to the present and does not belong to the past. He is, in very truth, "the living Christ."

So, while we cannot go beyond the picture of perfect manhood that is drawn for us in the New Testament, we can interpret that picture in such a way as to give it new meaning. Just as a mature and artistically cultivated person will discern in a masterpiece the qualities of æsthetic value that are hidden from the child or the untrained observer and which are inherent in himself, so the man of refined reason can find in the epic story of Jesus Christ the meanings and values which he himself prizes most highly; while the man of lesser growth too may see in it that which is valuable and significant to his inferior judgment.

As a matter of fact, it is not the Jesus Christ of the Gospels who is too great for the hearts of higher men. Higher men of the greater worship project a Jesus Christ from their soul's Dream of Perfection who is too great for their attainment. This must be so. Man's worship must needs always outstrip his practical achievement. The worship of contemporary men who are great in science and great of soul is necessarily superior to that of men who lived in a more restricted objective area and

whose reason was less subtly refined. This is a mark of spiritual progress.

Perhaps, however, the most striking proof of man's growth in worshipful capacity is found by a consideration of the increase in number of those whose objectification of the inward Dream takes the form of what might be called *self-symbolism*. This is simply the practice of creating in the mind an image or eidolon of oneself at his imaginable best, and of employing the image thus created as the object of worship.

To be able to do this, without serious loss of spiritual ground, a man must be rarely gifted both inwardly and outwardly, and must be sure that his critical and creative reason is sufficiently refined to project a truly exalted picture of his ideal self upon the screen of space-time. Otherwise, his worship will become shoddy and his inner life will be stultified; while externally he will present himself in the grotesque draperies of a strutting braggart. Few men, relatively, have ever successfully followed themselves, or lifted up their imagined selves as objects of aspiring worship. Yet those who have done so are the sovereign personalities of the race.

It appears that in our time a numerical increase in such rare personalities may be noticed. These, while sacramentalizing every phase of experience,

view as the chief sacrament of worship their own treasured self-ideal; and to the service of this ideal they bend every effort both subjective and objective. These constitute themselves each his own Redeemer, Hero-Prince, and Saviour. They develop each his own mythology, which is the idealized story of his own life in the third world of experience toward which all integrated personalities are reaching.

Such men as Emerson, Whitman, Lincoln, Thoreau, Burroughs, and others of their spiritual type, represent this outreach toward self-idealization at its consummate best. But in addition to these outstandingly gifted men there are many more whose aspiration in this direction has been notably successful in its outcome. In almost every community in America to-day there are a selected few whose worship is directed toward a spiritually lofty conception of what they themselves might be. On the whole, these are the most thoroughly integrated and the most exquisitely organized personalities in the community. If they often hold themselves aloof from the churches, it is because the worship of the churches would, as they believe, act as an impediment rather than as an aid to their worship.

It is from this minority of especially developed people that, undoubtedly, the leadership of the

race toward a recovery of religion and the establishment of a new worshipfulness is being recruited. It is by this group that man's more exultant stretch into the third world of experience is being stimulated and inspired. They furnish the most conclusive demonstration of the reality of spiritual progress in modern times!

Before we bring this discussion to its close we shall endeavour to point out the justification for a statement previously made, that by worship man not only reaches into a third world of experience but actually overcomes death. This we shall now proceed to do.

Death is a phenomenon associated with spatio-temporal experience. When one dies, he does so in some particular place and at some definite time. Experience which is nonspatial and nontemporal, such as the experience of man within his soul, is not only free from the limitations of death but is oblivious to or unaware of death. Subjective man neither dies nor can be conscious of the fact of death. This obvious truth leads us to declare that the soul is intrinsically and of necessity immortal, since it is unlimited and undisturbed by duration of time or extent of space. If, then, man were exclusively subjective and if he could become entirely mystic, the problem of death would not trouble him. Swallowed up in the Absolute he

would know nothing either of birth or death, nor would he be conscious of the passage of space-time events between birth and death. But he would not possess individuality.

If, on the other hand, man were exclusively objective and if he could become entirely a materialist, death would be the final term of his existence. The breakdown of his physical organism would conclude the fleeting episode which he calls "life." What he calls "individuality" would be similar to the "individuality" of a rock, a tree, or that of any spatio-temporal aggregation of cells.

Man, however, being both soul and body, is both immortal and mortal. He is superior to death and yet under its dominion. Living in two separate worlds, he must expect that at a certain time and in a certain place his body will return to the elements from which it came and his personal consciousness flicker out to share the soul experience no more.

Only as man is able somehow to unite body and soul in one coherent experience that involves the subjective and the objective, and which reaches into a third world, can he hope for personal survival beyond the hour of his physical disintegration.

If he can accomplish such a feat he is saved from death.

We have declared that through worship man

can accomplish this. It remains to be shown that such a declaration is more than a mere boast.

The argument stands or falls as we are able or fail to demonstrate the reality of the word which man seems to enter by means of the projection of his experience of the Absolute in prayer and meditation out upon the screen of nature.

The question is: Does worship introduce man to a real world where he can live as a unified and integrated personality?

If the question must be answered in the negative man's quest is hopeless and his doom is sealed. In such a case he is the dupe of his own aspiring folly and his entire course upon the earth has been the pursuit of a mirage.

The senses tell man of a world built on a basis of three spatial dimensions and one dimension called time.

The intuition tells him of a world built upon a nondimensional basis in which the qualities of Goodness, Beauty, Truth, and Love are met in the Absolute.

Can these worlds be combined in human consciousness by the critical and creative reason in such a way as to include a world of higher dimensionality wherein conscious personal experience may carry through?

The technique of worship presupposes such a

possibility. It takes the intuition of complete Perfection into the relative world of sense impression and suffuses the sense impressional world with an awareness of the wondrous. This wondrously suffused world is treated as real in the most legitimate use of that term. What to the strictly objective mind is mythical or fanciful is to the worshipful mind actual and demonstrable. Goodness, Beauty, Truth, and Love are projected into space-time, with the result that while space-time is transcended, the Absolute qualities are limited—although they are not restricted to spatio-temporal bounds. The bounds are, rather, *personal;* that is they extend to the furthermost possible reach of personal attainment through aspiration. *The character of man's most luminous symbol or image of individual perfection describes the circumferference of his utmost attainable experience in worship.* Thus far and no farther may the qualities of absolute Goodness, Beauty, Truth, and Love be taken by the critical and creative reason into the third world of experience.

If, then, reality be ascribed to the critical and creative reason, the same ascription must be given to the world toward which the reason leads man's integrated and unified personality. In other words, a world which transcends space-time and yet which is less than the world of Absolute values must be

acknowledged as not only conceivable but as necessary in the very nature of things.

Wherefore man's worshipful experience may be justified to him as valid not merely as the means to achieve the unification of his two worlds, but also as the method by which he escapes the dominance of physical death.

Through worship man reaches into a third world wherein he discovers himself to be creatively immortal. He gains what has been called a "spiritual body." Not waiting for physical dissolution to end the spatio-temporal phase of existence, he takes measures (while still in the range of five-sensory experience) to graduate, as it were, from sensory to spiritual understanding of the objective world. He projects his inner life upon the stage of outer necessity and brings the Absolute to bear upon the relative. Whereupon the outer world is changed, he himself becomes " a new creature," his symbolic image of Perfection assumes the status of reality in an extended universe, and when death finally arrives to do its work he easily and readily (as an integrated personality) passes out from even the most rudimentary association with the world which sense impression had once reported to his consciousness.

This he is able to do only after he has estab-

lished for himself the reality of the inner as well as of the outer world, has accepted the dilemma of his dual experience, and has unified his life through worship. In this process, from first to last, the critical and creative reason has acted as analytic agent and organizing force. Without the reason man's life would be a maelstrom of conflicting and whimsical moods, issuing ultimately in his disappearance as an individual. The reason is man's most necessary instrument; and the more highly refined and the more subtle his reason, the more able he is to fulfil his larger destiny.

We are ready now to conclude our argument for the recovery of religion.

The objective overemphasis of the scientific age in which we are now living has temporarily crippled man on his inner or subjective side. His reason has concerned itself more with his sensory than with his intuitive experience; and following science, it has shown a disposition to interpret life from a restrictedly spatio-temporal standpoint. The place occupied by religion at this juncture is that of a gradually evaporating reminiscence of what was formerly a vital contact between man's soul and the Absolute. Prayer and meditation have grown sickly while the sciences have waxed strong.

We have reached a point of crisis when the

religious survivals that as yet persist are swiftly being replaced by substitutes for religion. Unless religion be recovered within the next generation it is likely either that the civilization which now holds dominion over mankind (so-called Western civilization) will collapse, or that the human race will make such lopsided progress along mechanistic lines that within one or two centuries at most humanity will have become unaware of the existence of God and will have developed into a species of mechanical automata, physically beautiful, socially well-ordered, intellectually keen, but spiritually as blank and as vacant as a marble statue!

The recovery of religion, through prayer and meditation, and the employment of the critical and creative reason upon the task of unifying subjective and objective experience by means of worship, will arrest the movement away from spiritual cultivation and will restore man to himself as an integrated and unified personality bound up with God in a mysterious and yet magnificent Destiny.

Let Whitman speak the closing word:

"Give me, O God, to sing that thought,
Give me, give him or her I love this quenchless faith
In Thy ensemble, whatever else withheld withhold not from us

Belief in plan of Thee enclosed in Time and
Space,
Health, peace, salvation universal.

"Is it a dream?
Nay but the lack of it the dream,
And failing it life's lore and wealth a dream,
And all the world a dream."

THE END

1931
1934
1938
1941
1954

DATE DUE

215
B811

BL 48 .B68 1929

Bradley, Dwight Jaques, 1889-

The recovery of religion

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BL48.B68 1929
Bradley, Dwig The recovery of religion /
3 0645 0004 5694 3